FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL) STUDENT'S ACADEMIC SUCCESS

A Dissertation

by

LESLIE ELIZABETH COMFORT

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Yolanda N. Padrón
Committee Members,	Constance J. Fournier
	Rodney C. Hill
	Joyce E. Juntune
Head of Department,	Victor L. Willson

December 2013

Major Subject: Educational Psychology

ABSTRACT

Given the high numbers of English as a Second Language (ESL) students who begin their studies at a community college, it is imperative that educators help these students thrive. The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which the factors of academic self-efficacy, acculturation, life satisfaction, and academic motivation affect ESL community college students' academic success. A convenience sample of 118 ESL students who were enrolled in an urban community college in the U.S. participated in the study. These students were volunteers who were enrolled in for-credit classes in the Teacher Education and Child Development Department during the summer and fall semesters in 2011. The following research questions were addressed: (a) Are there significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on academic self-efficacy?, (b) Are there significant differences between successful students and less successful students on cultural congruity?, (c) Are there significant differences between successful students and less successful students on a measure of academic motivation and life satisfaction?, and (d) What impact does going to college have on ESL students' family life, work life, and social life?

The participants were asked to complete three Likert-type questionnaires and several open-ended items. Results indicated that ESL community college students understand the expectations of their professors, and that they are able to master the coursework using their study skills. Students also perceived that they were accepted in the community college environment and experienced less identity and cultural conflict.

Students were also positively impacted by their family's support and understood the benefits of attending college. However, they had a difficult time dealing with competing time demands (i.e., work, school, family time). The results from the open-ended items showed that the ESL student's family, work, and social life all play a part in college success. Results from the questionnaires showed that these students' lives were substantially impacted by attending college. Findings suggested that community colleges can recognize and enhance their ESL students' strengths rather than simply expecting them to assimilate into the academic environment.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, and to my friends at Houston Community College. Without their encouragement and belief in my abilities, I would not have continued working toward attaining my Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Yolanda N. Padrón, for her patience, advice, and wisdom during this process. I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. Joyce E. Juntune, Dr. Constance J. Fournier, and Professor Rodney C. Hill, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Thank you also to the numerous faculty and staff members I worked with for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience.

I also want to extend my gratitude to all the English as a second language community college students who were willing to participate in the study. And, I want to extend my appreciation to my tutor, Susana Franco, without whose assistance my data collected from surveying these students would not have been tabulated.

Finally, thank you to my colleagues at Houston Community College for their encouragement, support, and belief that I could complete this degree. I especially appreciate the patience shown by the faculty in the Department of Early Childhood Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

College students that are classified as English as a second language (ESL) come to attain that classification through many avenues. Some ESL students are classified by their college or university as international students because they have left their home country for the express purpose of studying at a college or university in the United States. Other students classified as ESL are immigrants to the U.S. and may or may not have spent some years studying in the U. S. before applying to a U. S. college or university. A third group of ESL students were born in the U. S., but did not learn English as their first language. This group may have even had one or more years of schooling in their home language before gaining literacy in English.

Most community colleges want their students to have a positive college experience, complete their academic goals, and enter the workforce. Many of these community colleges are trying innovative ways to meet the needs of their student populations such as web-based advising, accelerated programs, weekend courses, and eight-week class schedules (Noonan & Waiwaiole, 2008). In addition, many colleges are adding first-year student success courses where students learn about support services, time management, and study skills as they develop relationships with peers and professors. These courses are often assigned a dedicated advisor who is available to the students throughout the first year (Kibler, Bunch, & Endris, 2011).

Another way to meet the educational needs of these students is to have students feel connected with the educational learning community by engaging in campus activities or extracurricular programs. However, Dougherty (1992) found that community college students were much less involved than other college students in activities outside of the classroom with faculty and peers. Likewise, minority and first-generation to attend college students traditionally have had less access to these college resources (Gray, Vitak, Easton & Ellison, 2013).

In addition, family members frequently exert pressure on international students to excel academically; which often demands long hours of studying. This can hinder the formation of supportive social networks (Glass & Westmont, 2013) and pose a significant barrier to student success (McJunkin, 2005) due to time constraints. These demands can include commuting to campus, working part or full-time and family commitments. In the 2003-04 school year, over 27% of community college students were married, 61% were financially independent (not classified as a dependent for tax purposes), and over 17% of them were single parents (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008).

The current design of college and university applications only requires that the prospective student identify their race or ethnicity. Therefore, no figures exist for the number of college students that consider themselves bilingual (Orlov, 2005). Approximately 5% of students in Texas universities and colleges are international ESL students. India, Mexico, and China are the leading places of origin for these students with Midtown Community College (a pseudonym), Texas A&M University, and

University of Texas at Austin educating the highest numbers of international students (Universities and Colleges in Texas, 2013).

More students than ever are enrolled in America's colleges and universities. Obtaining a college degree is perceived to provide a number of benefits including increased job opportunities and lifetime earnings (Gray, et al., 2013). As part of this trend, increasing numbers of ESL students are enrolling in America's colleges. As in past times, contemporary immigrants see higher education as a path to careers and better-paying jobs. Many of these students are recent immigrants to the United States. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2008), slightly over 18% of college students in 2007 were ESL students, and another 3.4% of these were nonresident aliens. These numbers of ESL college students and nonresident aliens have doubled since 1980, with specific groups increasing at an even faster rate. For example, the number of Hispanic high school graduates immediately enrolling in college is at a record high. This number has risen from 49% in 2000 to 69% in 2012 (Fry & Taylor, 2013). In addition to the demographic changes, the number of students that attend community colleges has increased to nearly half (46 %) of all U.S. undergraduates attending colleges (Noonan-Terry & Waiwaiole, 2008). In fact, two thirds of Latino college students start out in community colleges, and almost half of all Asian/Pacific Islanders begin their studies in a community college (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2007).

There are several characteristics that are common to ESL college students. ESL college students are more likely to enroll on a part-time basis and are more likely to be from low-income families. These students most often start their college careers at a

community college, because there they encourage part-time attendance and have lower tuition rates (Fike & Fike, 2008). There is a disproportionate number of community college students who are members of minority groups, grew up in families where English was not the primary language, or have parents who did not attend college (Mangan, 2013). For instance, Hispanic college students are less likely to enroll in a university, are less likely to enroll full-time, and are less likely that white students to complete a bachelor's degree (Fry & Taylor, 2013).

Two important challenges for these ESL students are acculturating into the college culture and acquiring academic language proficiency. The community college poses its own cultural differences to learning for the ESL student. The challenge of acculturation is compounded by the very nature of the student body at a community college—it is diverse in economics, culture, religion, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. Acculturation refers to the process of intercultural adaptation which encompasses both psychological and socio-cultural adaptation (Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008). Others have defined acculturation as the process by which members of one cultural group adopt the beliefs and behaviors of another group (Castillo, Conoley, & Brossart, 2004). These behaviors include language usage, social affiliation practices, and daily living habits.

Acquiring academic language proficiency is another challenge. According to Schumann (1986), the learner will acquire the second language only to the degree that he or she acculturates to the target language group. That is, students who adjust to the mainstream culture are more likely to learn that target language (Cheng & Fox, 2008). In

addition to the cultural issues, there are other variables for the ESL college student including length of time in an English-speaking country, degree of motivation and maturity, educational background, and desired field of study (Cheng & Fox, 2008). This necessitates getting the ESL student acclimated and/or acculturated to the college culture as quickly as possible to facilitate the student's success.

Acquiring academic language proficiency continues to challenge the ESL college student. Cummins (1994) developed a model for distinguishing between two types of language proficiency. This model may be key for explaining why this process of acquiring academic language proficiency proves so elusive to many ESL college students. According to Cummins, Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) are developed initially in the context of everyday conversation in the target language. According to Cummins to acquire academic language proficiency, which he termed Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), an individual must have used the targeted language from five to seven years in an environment that is not merely conversation-based. Cheng and Fox (2008) studied Canadian college students and found that acculturating to the mainstream culture was a key to learning academic English. Schumann (1986) stated that learning a language means learning its culture. Bosher and Smalkoski (2002), studied ESL college students and found that many of them had difficulty succeeding academically in a nursing program. They found that language difficulties were cited as one of the factors which contributed to most student attrition. Wright (1998) asserted that low proficiency in academic literacy, which includes the distinctive type of English used in classrooms and textbooks, is a contributing factor to

academic failure among ESL college students. He studied college-bound, ESL secondary students and found that many were extremely under-prepared for the language demands that post-secondary classes would require.

One factor that has also been identified as affecting a student's successful completion of college is academic self-efficacy. Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as beliefs about your own ability to organize behavioral, cognitive, and social skills in a way that produces a desired behavioral objective. This can further be defined as beliefs about the ability to organize oneself to meet the academic objectives defined by both the student and the educational institution.

Tinto (1993) found that academic success in college was positively associated with classroom engagement. In addition, students with high levels of self-efficacy think that they can accomplish their academic goals. Self-efficacy can be defined as the strength of a person's belief that they are going to be able to produce a desired behavior, whereas college self-efficacy is a student's degree of confidence that they can complete college-related tasks (Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis, 1993). In interviews with 17 Hispanic community college students, Zell (2010) discovered the importance of not only academic self-efficacy to these students, but also the belief that they were getting greater value for their time and money investment at a community college as opposed to attending a university.

According to research, another factor that has been found to make a difference in the academic success of ESL students is the academic motivation that the ESL student brings with them to college (Reynolds, & Weigand, 2010). Academic motivation is

influenced by many variables according to Reynolds and Weigand (2010). These variables can include work obligations, family commitments and support, and maybe the type of high school experience e.g., did they come from a rigorous system – they know they can do the work, or a less rigorous system – they do not know if they can do the work. Studying 164 first-year undergraduate university students, Reynolds and Weigand (2010) examined relationships among academic motivation, resilience, and self-efficacy as they related to first-semester Grade Point Average (GPA). They found that only two variables, race and resilience, were significantly related to the students' GPA, though academic motivation, resilience, and self-efficacy were found to be significantly related to each other. Higher levels of self-efficacy and resilience correlated with more intrinsic academic motivation among the first-year students.

Previous studies have cited Hispanic college students' lack of access to a quality high school education being the result of low socioeconomic status (Becerra, 2010). Earning a General Education Development Certificate (GED) takes a lot of personal motivation, but it is not the same as doing well in a class. In addition, the classroom experience can be impacted by external factors. The community college student typically is dependent on financial aid, has one or more children, is a minority or ESL student, and works full-time. Additionally, the typical community college student does not live on campus, but is a commuter, and is self-supporting. Unlike the traditional college student who attends a residential college full-time immediately after high school graduation, the community college student has often delayed enrollment by a year or more, possesses a GED certificate rather than a high school diploma, is only able to attend classes part-

time, and may be a single parent (Roman, 2007). In addition, 39% are the first in their family to attend college, and 60% are women. Furthermore, Community College Advising (2009) states that students are coming to community colleges with more and more personal issues that cause roadblocks to completing their education such as, substance abuse, prior incarceration, and being in abusive relationships. For these students, academic achievement has been found to be challenging.

Besides difficulties communicating in English, cultural conflicts, and their unfamiliarity with the American higher education system, ESL college students often face time constraints and the strain of balancing responsibilities at school, home, and work. These factors influence each student's life satisfaction, which in turn affects their success in college. They are also more often nonwhite, poorer, less academically able, and more likely to be a part-time student because of work or family commitments (Dougherty, 1992). For example, Fike and Fike (2008) found that community college students tend to be 25 years old or older, be classified as ESL, be enrolled on a part-time basis, and are more likely to be from low-income families. In the 2003-04 school year, over 27% of community college students were married, 61% were financially independent (not classified as a dependent for tax purposes), and over 17% of them were single parents (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). Community college students also tend not to engage in any extra-curricular activities such as college clubs or sports associations because of the previously mentioned time constraints that include family and job responsibilities and other constraints such as challenges in commuting to the campus. Although joining a group leads to acculturation and appears to contribute to

persistence toward graduation (Tietjen-Smith, Masters, Smith, and Waller, 2009), many ESL college students may not have time to participate in these activities.

As stated previously, a student's level of acculturation, income, and family support have also been shown to be predictors of college success. In a study of 247 Mexican American female college students, it was revealed that many of the students had to balance family commitments with the pursuit of a college education (Castillo, et al., 2004). According to the findings from self-report questionnaires, many of these female students found themselves caught in families that told them to be academically successful, yet expected them to remain true to the traditional gender role of wife and mother.

In reviewing the literature, very few studies were found that examined student success factors in the urban community college setting. Much of the current knowledge about student retention and success comes from studies conducted at universities (Zell, 2010). One reason for this may be that community college faculty members' primary responsibility is teaching rather than conducting research. Therefore, this may be a contributing factor to the dearth of research examining the factors that contribute to community college students' academic success. It is also important to note that this research is needed because what works at universities may not necessarily work at community colleges (Ellis-O'Quinn, 2011). No studies were found that identified specific factors that contribute to success for the ESL community college student. This study proposes to identify student success factors in ESL students from a large, urban community college.

College students classified as ESL come to higher education with varying degrees of English academic literacy. Knowing what factors may contribute to success that can be provided by the community college is essential. Therefore, this study examines factors such as academic self-efficacy, acculturation, life satisfaction, and academic motivation as they relate to the successful ESL college student. It is clear that ESL students come to the college setting with many issues not usually seen in typical American college students. Therefore it is also important to identify the barriers to successful college performance for these students. The purpose of this study is to determine the degree to which these factors of academic self-efficacy, acculturation, life satisfaction, and academic motivation affect ESL community college students' academic success. Identifying the degree to which these factors affect academic success may help to retain ESL students in the community college and could assist community colleges in developing programs that could help students to adapt to their new culture, and consequently become more academically successful.

The following research questions are addressed:

(a) Are there significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on academic self-efficacy?

(b) Are there significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on cultural congruity?

(c) Are there significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on a measure of academic motivation and life satisfaction?

(d) What impact does going to college have on ESL students' family life, work life, and social life?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Academic Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as beliefs about one's abilities to organize behavioral, cognitive, and social skills in a manner that will produce a desired behavioral objective. For the community college student, this translates into being able to successfully perform college-related tasks such as participating in class discussion, taking notes, and using the campus library for research (Solberg, et. al., 2010). These also include academic literacy-related competencies such as the ability to write a term paper using Standard English or knowledge of the Internet as a research tool. One of the challenges for ESL students is learning college-level communication which includes academic reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Lunsford, Fishman & Liew (2013) contend that literacy achievement is part of a hidden curriculum that equates with public conformity to the policies of most colleges and universities. This academic literacy is a hidden barrier for many of these students, and puts them at greater risk of dropping out of college than the native English-speaking college student. Low proficiency in academic literacy, which includes the distinctive type of English used in classrooms and textbooks, is a contributing factor to academic failure among ESL college students (Wright, 1998).

Academic reading is considered basic for a student to succeed in college-level coursework (Illowsky, 2008). In 2006, Song found that many ESL students were not

prepared for the difficulty level of the reading on tests. Fike and Fike (2008) stated that college-level reading comprehension and reading strategies are essential for students to be able to read and understand their textbooks. Cummins (1981) asserted that academic language proficiency is necessary in order for students to use language for thinking and reasoning – which are the very skills demanded to participate effectively in most college classes.

According to McJunkin (2005), ESL students are more successful in a community college when instructional programs incorporate academic as well as cultural components. Efforts to help ESL students improve their academic literacy are often viewed not as the job of the typical college professor, but as the province of English as Second Language classes (Gray & Vernez, 1996). In a qualitative study done in Puerto Rico by Morales and Blau (2009), it was found that the cultural identity of the teachers had a big impact on how instruction was delivered. Teachers with the same cultural background as the students were more successful in helping the students learn English. Findings from a study conducted by Hagedorn, Chi, Cepeda, and McLain (2007) indicated a relationship between academic success of Latino community college students and the proportion of Latino students and faculty on campus. These two forces fostered a sense of belonging and social integration among the students studied.

Although English written composition is required of virtually all incoming college students in the U. S., college composition programs remain unprepared for ESL writers who are required to enroll in these courses (Matsuda, 2006). In looking at the college setting as a contributor to ESL college student success, Gray and Vernez (1996)

studied 14 colleges (five were community colleges) in California, Chicago, New York, New Jersey, and Florida who had significant ESL populations. They found that few faculty members were willing or able to adjust their teaching styles to assist ESL students. However, they also found that many faculty members were reluctant to penalize ESL students who, despite communication difficulties, were able to complete the course requirements. This ambiguity about the importance of English-language skills, teaching styles to assist ESL students, and grading practices often leads to educational inequities. For example, when one professor penalizes a struggling student for his or her inadequate skills in English, and another professor ignores this.

Similarly, Huang (2004) studied 78 Chinese students at an American university and found that many things in the teaching styles of these professors could be generalized as difficulties for the Chinese students. Huang found that American professors speak English quickly, they do not pronounce each word clearly, and they tend to use long and complex sentences. Other challenges were the use of slang, sarcasm, and colloquial expressions. Another finding was that American professors sometimes mention unfamiliar examples or situations that happen only in American culture making it difficult for ESL students to understand the lecture.

Successful ESL college students often have good rapport with their professors. Gan, Humphreys, & Hamp-Lyons (2004) conducted a study of two small groups (18 students total) of Chinese university students learning English as a foreign language. Unsuccessful students in these college English classes responded via interview that they felt that their university English professors were not supportive or approachable.

Successful students in this study used multiple strategies to practice English, and maintained a good rapport with their English teachers.

Academic self-efficacy, as has been shown, is an important factor in persistence in learning academic English as well as in pursuing a college degree. Zell (2010) found that students had self-efficacy if they believed that their education was valuable, and that their community college was giving them value for their dollar. These students found that they could accomplish their academic goals by depending on the resources available to them and their cognitive abilities.

In summary, research has shown that ESL college students face many challenges such as academic literacy, and lack of professor-student compatibility. Studies have indicated that ESL college students are more successful in programs that address both their academic and cultural needs, and have professors who modify their instructional strategies accordingly. The next section discusses the importance of culture and language for these students.

Acculturation and Language

One of the greatest barriers to a college education for immigrant students is inadequate language skills (Gray & Vernez, 1996). Curry (2004) studied academic literacy in immigrants, and she contended that inadequate language skills play a prime role in college retention. Increasing immigration showcases the importance for a quick resolution to the unresolved questions about the need for ESL college students' mastery of academic English as well as mastery of the classroom culture. There is a dearth of

research that focuses on adult ESL learners with limited literacy and formal schooling (Vinogradov & Bigelow, 2010).

Kim (2006) found that the three most common teaching strategies that graduate school professors engage in are whole-class discussions, small-group discussions, and students' raising issues during class. Because of this, she postulates that students' listening and speaking skills are an essential component to successful completion of a course. Cheng and Fox (2008) stated that academic oral communication such as giving presentations or participating in class discussions along with academic writing were the two most difficult skills for ESL college students to master. According to Reynolds and Weigand (2010), when first-year college students actively participated in class and joined campus organizations, they were more successful both academically and in their acculturation process. In addition, social support factors and acculturation were found to be important for Hispanic college students' success (Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis, 1993). In fact, feeling a part of the campus community (belongingness) is one of the most frequently cited factors for international college students' academic success (Glass & Westmont, 2013).

Individuality and independence are valued in American culture; however, immigrant and international college students often come from cultures that do not value these two traits so highly. For example, Russian students often see class work as a group effort and sharing answers as helping a friend (Rubenstein, 2006). Students from Islamic countries value respect for authority, and it is not unusual for parents to choose the courses their child will take towards a designated career goal, and Haitian students learn

by dictation and often do not come to American colleges with experience in organizing professors' lectures into meaningful notes (Brilliant, 2000). White American culture values uniqueness, independence, autonomy, and self-reliance. Achievement, competition, and personal accomplishments are also important.

In contrast, many ESL college students come from cultures where family background and values stress cooperation rather than competition, and the welfare of the group, as opposed to the individual, is highly valued. For example, family unity and loyalty are highly valued among Mexican Americans (Castillo, et al., 2004). Chinese and Russian cultures are two examples of group-oriented cultures. That is, individual needs are subservient to those of the group, and education is seen as a tool for strengthening the country (Rubenstein, 2006).

In 2005, Lee and Carrasquillo interviewed 25 American college professors and 19 Korean college students attending school in the U. S. about learning styles. The participating professors found these student traits: lack of class participation, professors viewed as absolute authorities, avoidance of eye contact, misunderstandings about plagiarism, problems with English structure, superb rote memorization skills, and puzzled by divergent questions. The Korean students viewed the role of the professor as that of an absolute authority, were most comfortable with large-group instruction, did not understand plagiarism, preferred lectures to other teaching strategies, and admitted difficulties with English oral communication and grammar. These authors concluded that Asian students do not actively participate in classroom discussions, but rather are used to

receiving their education passively; however because of the small sample size these findings cannot be generalized beyond the study participants.

Chinese graduate students in a study conducted by Kim (2006) stated that they rarely had difficulty asking professors questions before or after class, or during office hours, however, asking questions during class was more difficult. Rubenstein (2006) suggested that this is common with Asian students who have been trained to ask questions only when they have first tried to find the answers on their own. Raising questions, and interrupting others to express their own opinions, would be foreign concepts to many immigrant and international college students (Kim, 2006). Another study by Jiang and Kuehn (2001) studied a mixed-group of 22 immigrants who spoke Russian, Spanish, or Hmong as their native language. They found that the immigrant college students who had been in the U. S. less than 10 years were more likely to ask someone about a new word that they encountered in their readings or in class as opposed to the immigrants who had been in the U. S. for longer than 10 years. These students considered themselves proficient in English and therefore should be able to decipher the new word themselves.

In both China and Russia, education is seen as a tool for strengthening the country rather than for the betterment of the individual according to Rubenstein (2006), and Chinese college students, teachers, and parents view intelligence as something that can be improved with hard work. Falling asleep during college lectures or text-messaging during the class period (common distractions in American college classrooms) would be unheard of in Chinese universities, as it is assumed that all

students will pay attention to the teacher. Huang (2006) stated that academic learning varies depending on the cultural context. Huang also postulated that Chinese students bring a Confucian-oriented perspective to their learning, while their American professors may have a more Socratic orientation. That means that the Chinese students valued the hard work of learning, had been taught to respect and obey authorities such as professors, and placed the importance of learning on being a productive citizen. The professors, who exhibited a more Socratic view of learning, valued overt and private questioning of beliefs, expression of personal hypotheses, and a desire for self-directed tasks. All of these findings point to the importance of professors becoming more knowledgeable about cultural diversity and multicultural educational practices in their teaching.

There are some other cultural barriers to successful college performance for the ESL student. One of these is the expectations American college professors bring into the classroom. Professors often expect their students, including ESL students, to be proficient at using technology and the internet (Rubenstein, 2006). This can be problematic for the ESL student who has had limited exposure to learning via computer, and because most internet sites are still in English, they often have difficulty using this tool for research. In a study conducted by Cheng and Fox (2008) in Canada, many of the students reported using the internet to read e-mail and news reports in their native language. This highlights the limitations of this technology because those ESL students who are computer-literate tend to use the computer to meet personal rather than educational needs.

ESL students tend to have difficulty understanding not only native English-speakers, but also English-speaking professors not raised in America. For example, an ESL college student may struggle communicating with a professor who grew up in Great Britain. According to Lee and Janda (2006), college students rated these professors as less competent than American professors in end-of-semester evaluations. Jacobs and Friedman (1988) observed that some college students avoid registering for a course in the printed schedule if the instructor has a "foreign-looking" name. According to Huang (2004), undergraduate ESL students at U. S. colleges and universities had more problems with colloquial and slang expressions than ESL graduate students. Gan, et al. (2004) suggested that most ESL students have difficulties with slang phrases and English humor. They propositioned that failure to understand these is culture-bound. In sum, research has shown that ESL college students have added difficulties communicating with some professors who lecture in non-Standard English.

Most American professors expect that a student who is having difficulty will ask for help (Rubenstein, 2006). However, some cultures see this as a sign of weakness or failure. Asking for help also can be dependent on whether the professor is male or female, and it also can depend on the ESL student's gender. Female ESL students from Islamic countries, for instance, would be very reticent to ask a male teacher for assistance (Brilliant, 2000).

Students attending college in a culture different from their home culture have to contend with novel social and educational organizations, behaviors, and expectations, according to Zhou, et al. (2008). International students who participate in campus-wide

cultural events, socialize with other international students, and make social connections with college students brought up in American culture are more likely to persist to graduation (Glass & Westmont, 2013). Studies have found that the more acclimated and connected students feel to the college social environment, the easier their transition to college life, and their persistence in college (Gray, et al., 2013). Unfortunately, many immigrant and international students falsely assume that the new culture operates like their home culture. Study groups, tutors, institutional supports, and classmates can play a role in acculturation (Cheng & Fox, 2008) although immigrant students are reluctant users of existing programs; including international student services (Gray & Vernez, 1996).

Rubenstein (2006) stated that financial aid stipulations and Visa requirements often force ESL students to enroll in credit-bearing classes before they are ready. One way to counteract this is to provide and encourage students to utilize student support services including counseling, tutoring, study groups, financial aid counseling, and academic advisement. Another way, according to Tinto (1987) would be to construct educational communities within college disciplines so that the ESL student is integrated into the ongoing social and intellectual life of the institution. He also suggested that this could be done at the classroom level to provide a low-risk climate for academic discourse in the target language.

ESL college students exhibit cultural, learning, and linguistic differences that are specific to the population and which may influence these students' academic achievement. For example, in a study of 25 American college professors and 19 Korean

students, Lee and Carrrasquillo (2006) discovered that the Korean students did not make eye contact with college professors during class discussions and conversations, were accustomed to receiving their education passively, and since there are no articles or prepositions in the Korean language, many students failed to use them in their speaking or writing. The Korean students responded by means of questionnaires and interviews that they thought that their lack of English mastery hindered their achievement in the classroom. They also expressed bewilderment at their professors' use of open-ended discussions or any forms of learning that were not lecture-oriented. Common to Korean as well as Chinese and other Asian students is the belief that there is no such thing as ownership of knowledge. Therefore, these students typically have a difficult time citing authors of the works they quote in their college term papers; they do not understand the concept of plagiarism.

College students from China view teachers as authority figures who disseminate knowledge and their academic assertions should be accepted without question (Zhou, et al., 2008). In Korea as in Haiti, students learn primarily through dictation and memorization (Rubenstein, 2006). In middle-Eastern countries such as Lebanon, students are expected to memorize everything that is presented to them, and professors are revered. ESL college students therefore, often are puzzled by American professors who use a more informal style of teaching to induce student learning.

Another barrier to academic success for the ESL student often involves the mode of assessment and testing, according to Brilliant (2000). This is often another area where differences abound in what the immigrant or international college student has

experienced in their home-country. For example, it would be unheard of in China for the professor to split the class into groups, assign a research topic, and then grade the students on the group's presentation. The multiple choice test widely used by American professors and by state certification entities is not widely used elsewhere in the world. Most American professors are reliant upon multiple choice tests, though these types of tests may be unfamiliar to students from outside of the U. S. Therefore immigrant and international college students may not have the necessary test-taking skills to perform well on these measures of content mastery (Rubenstein, 2006).

The aforementioned studies have examined the multiple issues that have to be addressed by ESL college students before they can successfully complete their coursework at a community college. Inadequate language skills, clashing cultural values, adaptation to non-lecture teaching methods, classroom etiquette differences, reluctance to utilize student support services, and testing difficulties are just a few of the issues these ESL students are facing. The following section investigates the role of academic motivation on ESL college students' success.

Academic Motivation

The motivation that brings the ESL student to a community college can be either extrinsic, intrinsic, or both. Thus, the extrinsically motivated student may be attending college for the purpose of obtaining an external reward such as a specific job upon completion of a two-year degree. Alternately, the student may be intrinsically motivated by an internal drive such as the love of learning. Results of a study by Reynolds and Weigand (2010) suggested that extrinsically motivated students attended college for

academic and social engagement reasons, whereas intrinsically motivated students attended college for similar reasons, but had a greater ability to cope with stress and adversity when confronted with academic difficulties.

For most ESL students, the key to being successful in college is to figure out what is expected in each class, and to pass with a high grade. To achieve this goal, students use many strategies including transfer of knowledge from their native country or culture to American college classrooms. Jiang and Kuehn (2001) stated that students with strong academic skills in their first language generally tend to acquire the needed college-class information in English more quickly than those without sufficient formal schooling in their native language. However, many college students today come to the campus underprepared and from diverse backgrounds. Not every student who has completed high school has the level of academic literacy necessary for college work in their own language let alone in English.

One study of 2,167 individuals who identified themselves either as Mexican or Mexican-American found that the place of birth was minimal compared to a student's academic history, and their motivation to go to school despite the difficulties associated with learning English and adjusting to a new culture (Padilla & Gonzalez, 2001). In another study conducted of 164 first-year university students by Reynolds and Weigand (2010), no relationship was found between motivation and grade point average (GPA). Therefore, high grades are not always the motivating factor that keeps students in the college classroom.

Many ESL students begin their college career by having to take not-for-credit college preparatory classes. During the 2003-2004 academic year, more (5%) ESL students attended community colleges than those who attended public institutions of higher education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). Taking these not-for-credit classes can be problematic for the ESL college students as many of them, particularly the ones attending community colleges, want to attain a one-year certificate or a two-year degree as quickly as possible so that they can join the workforce. This is their motivation for attending college. Taking non-credit classes act as a barrier, in both time and money, to these students' real purpose for attending college. Illowsky (2008), who studied the California community college system, reported that 70-80% of first-time college students needed to take one or more of these not-for-credit classes. She also found that only 29% of the students who were enrolled in not-for-credit college preparatory classes in the 2006-2007 academic year earned a one-year certificate, an associate's degree, or transferred to a four-year institution.

The state of Texas requires that all students must test prior to enrollment to determine their readiness to enroll in college-level courses (Kever, 2010). For most ESL students, the scores point towards taking one or more not-for-credit college preparatory classes. These are classes any below-academic-proficiency college students in Texas must take before they can enroll in for-credit courses. Both native-English speakers and ESL students are required to take one or more of these preparatory classes if their test scores reveal low-academic proficiency. Preparatory courses typically cover mathematics, English reading, or English writing. Students are placed in these classes on

the basis of low test scores such as those on the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA), Assessment Skills for Successful Entry and Transfer (ASSET) or the Computer Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System (COMPASS). "It's a huge issue," (p. A3) said state Representative Dan Branch, chairman of the House Higher Education Committee, speaking of the need for Texas college students to take not-for-credit college preparatory classes. At Midtown Community College, for example, almost 70% of college students are required to take at least one remedial course (Kever, 2010).

In brief, research has shown that students come to college with either extrinsic or intrinsic motivation. For example, some students may be extrinsically motivated to attain high course grades. Their academic background and their native language literacy may also influence their academic success. Taking not-for-credit college preparatory classes may also hinder their motivation to continue. The section below examines life satisfaction as another factor that influences student success.

Life Satisfaction

In contrast to traditional college students who attend a four-year university, the community college student often has the additional responsibilities of a job and a family and these can lead to overload. The ESL community college student has these stressors plus the addition of language and cultural issues added to the mix. Coping with stress in the K-12 academic setting has been widely investigated, but few studies have been specific to adult education (Giancola, Grawitch, & Borchert, 2009), and fewer still have focused on the ESL community college student. After a student evaluates the stress of life events with either a positive or negative appraisal, he or she then behaves in ways

that may affect academic success. One facet of this study will examine the impact that life satisfaction has on the ESL community college student in regards to their success in college as measured by their GPA.

Students who had a clear conviction that their choice of the community college was the right choice for them, and students who had made long-term goals about their career aspirations (therefore they had educational goals in mind at the onset of their college career) had the greatest retention rate (Conway, 2010). Buddington (2002) studied 150 Jamaican college students enrolled at Howard University. He found that Jamaican students with spouses from the same culture tended to fare better academically than those who married outside of their culture.

Al-Sharideh and Goe (1998) found that international college students who established a social relationship with others from similar backgrounds, were buffered from the problems associated with a lack of acculturation of American culture. The process of acquiring a second language can be related to identity issues with immigrant college students. In addition, many of these students have come to the U. S. as refugees. Some are from countries that no longer exist or are in the midst of civil war or famine. Besides leaving behind relatives and friends to study in the U. S., many of them leave behind a spouse or child who is in an unsafe environment. Immigrant college students must balance living in a new environment with maintaining their own identity. Zhou, et al. (2008) maintains that immigrant and international students must have interactions with native English-speaking college students, teachers, and counselors through whom they can learn culturally relevant skills to facilitate their academic success.

Increasing numbers of ESL students on college campuses adds to the ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity of American college classrooms. Many of these students will enroll in U. S. college classrooms not oriented in terms of cultural, learning, and linguistic expectations. All of these students will go through some degree of intercultural adaptation or acculturation to the U. S. system of education. For many of these ESL college students, personal adjustment to life in American colleges and universities may be facilitated by the establishment of social groups of students from similar cultural backgrounds as well as making connections with college students brought up in American culture (Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998). In short, research has shown that life responsibilities and stresses impact students' college performance. Successful college students set academic and life goals, maintain a tie to their cultural community, and immerse themselves in the college culture.

As stated thus far in this review of the literature, many factors contribute to the ESL college student's persistence and subsequent completion of a certificate or degree. Previous studies have concentrated on populations of university students, and little research has been done on the community college population. Additionally, limited research has focused on the ESL college student in the community college setting. The purpose of this study is to examine factors such as academic self-efficacy, acculturation, academic motivation, and life satisfaction that may influence how ESL community college students face the challenges of staying in school and finishing with a certificate or degree. Research questions identified for this study are as follows: (a) Are there significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful

students on academic self-efficacy?, (b) Are there significant differences between successful students and less successful students on cultural congruity?, (c) Are there significant differences between successful students and less successful students on a measure of academic motivation and life satisfaction?, and (d) What impact does going to college have on ESL students' family life, work life, and social life?

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Participants

For the purpose of this study, a sample of convenience of current international, immigrant, and adult ESL students who are enrolled in a large, urban community college located in the southwest region of the United States was used. Overall, the college had approximately 65,000 students enrolled in the for-credit courses during the fall 2011 semester. More than half of these students (59%) were female and 41% were male. In terms of ethnicity, 33% were Hispanic, 33% African American, 17% White, 14% Asian, and 3% Other. The majority of these students (38%) were in 18-22 age group, followed by 34% in the 23-30 age range, 22% in the 31-50 age range, 3% under 18, and 3% over 50 years of age. (Midtown Community College Office of Institutional Research, 2012).

Participants were selected from students who were enrolled in for-credit classes taught during the summer and fall semesters (2011) at Midtown Community College (MCC) (a pseudonym) within the Teacher Education and Child Development Department. Demographic information indicated that there were a total of 602 students enrolled in this department during the fall 2010 semester at this campus. Of these, 93% were female, and 7% were male. The ages of these students ranged from 18 to over 50 years old. The majority of these students (227) were in the 31-50 age group followed by the 23-30 age group (215). Only 120 students fell into the traditional college age range of 18 through 22. The predominant ethnic group represented by these 602 students was

Hispanic with 188 enrolled students, followed by 28 students who identified themselves as international students, while just 20 students described themselves as Asian (Midtown Community College Office of Institutional Research, 2010). College-wide in the fall of 2010, over 85% of Hispanic students and 100% of the Asian students at MCC obtained some type of financial aid to be able to attend college (Midtown Community College Office of Institutional Research, 2010).

The participants were selected from undergraduate classes taught both by the researcher and by other faculty members from the Teacher Education and Child Development Department. The students chosen from MCC have learned English as a second language. The students participating in the study were told that participation was voluntary, and that non-participation would not in any way affect their ultimate course grade. Table 1 shows the percentages of students in terms of GPA, age, gender, ethnicity, native language, and literacy in the native language. Table 2 reports the percentages of students in terms of marital status, parenthood, living situation, first in family to attend college, enrolled hours, employment status, and participation in extracurricular activities.

Knowing the participants' grade point average (GPA) is important to answer three of the four research questions in this study. GPA data included the 118 participants in the present study. The GPAs were grouped into two categories: 2.00-2.99 and 3.00-4.00. Sixty-five of these ESL community college students had GPAs in the range of 3.00-4.00 (55.1%). The remaining participants included 53 (44.9%) students with a GPA of 2.00-2.99.

The ages of participants ranged from 18 to over 55 years of age. The majority (29.7%) of the participants were ages 23-30 followed by the range of 18-22 (27.1%). The third largest group was of students aged 37-45 (19.5%). These statistics are reflective of MCC age averages for all students taking these classes. The gender of the study participants was overwhelmingly female with 102 (86.4%); males accounted for 16 (13.6%) of the participants. This falls slightly below the departmental average of 93% of the total population being female, as 86.4% of the study participants were female.

Ethnicity and cultural questions were asked as part of the *Cultural Congruity Scale (CCS).* Therefore, questions about ethnicity, native language, and literacy in the native language were a part of the demographic survey (See Appendix B). For purposes of this study, ethnicity statistics were gathered using the same designations used on college admission forms for MCC. Seven of the study participants were White (6.0%), four were Black (3.4%), 76 were Hispanic (65.0%), 27 were Asian (23.1%), and three participants chose the label "Other" (2.6%).

All of the Hispanic study participants stated that their native language was Spanish (58.5%). Asian participants spoke a variety of native languages including Vietnamese (9.3%), Korean (1.7%), Urdu (2.5%), Turkish (1.7%), and Tagalog (1.7%). Other languages cited by the study participants included Cantonese, Farsi, Persian, Malayalam, Gujarati, Igbo, Kingyarwanda, Polish, and American Sign Language. In each of these instances, only one participant spoke that language, so percentages of the total were less than 1%. Several of the participants reported that their native language consisted of two languages learned in tandem. The language duos cited included

English/Spanish (5.1%), Chinese/Taiwanese (1.7%), and Arabic/English (1.7%), with English/French, Ewe/French, English/Nigerian, German/Spanish, and French/Arabic being cited by one participant for each category. One hundred two participants (86.4%) stated that they could read and write in their native language, while 16 (13.6%) could not.

Questions about the students' families were asked in the demographic survey, because the *Life Satisfaction and Academic Motivation Questionnaire (LSAM)* items surveyed participants about family-school relationships. Approximately half of the participants were single (50.8%). The remaining participants were married (33.1%), divorced/separated (15.3%), or widowed (0.8%). Fifty-four of these college students did not have children (54.2%). Of the 45.8% who did have children, one child (37.0%) or two children (32.6%) were the norm. However, 14 (30.4%) participants had more than three children. For the most part, these college students lived with other family members (70.3%). Just 14 (11.9%) of these students lived alone, while 14 (11.9%) lived with a "significant other" and 5.9% lived with a friend or roommate(s). When asked, "Are you the first in your family to go to college?" 52 (44.4%) of these ESL college students responded that they were.

In terms of enrollment, students were enrolled either part-time or full-time. Fifty-nine percent of the participants were enrolled part-time while 41% were attending college on a full-time basis. Participants were also asked to report on their employment hours on the demographic survey. Forty students (34.8%) reported that they were not working at the time that the survey was administered. The majority of students who did

work stated that they worked full time (more than 21 hours) (48.7%) each week. Part-time workers (less than 20 hours per week) made up 16.5% of the participants.

Participants were asked, on the demographic survey, to relate which (if any) extracurricular activities that they participated in on a regular basis. This information ties to the life satisfaction portion of the *LSAM*. Thirty (25.4%) of the participants did not report participation in any extracurricular activities. Of those who did participate in extracurricular activities, the majority just reported participation in one activity. For example, 28.8% reported participating in church activities. This was followed by participation in a community volunteer organization (12.7%). Sports teams were popular with 5.9% of the participants, and 4.2% belonged to a college club or organization. Twenty-seven students participated in more than one extracurricular activity on a regular basis. These included church and community volunteering (14.4%), sports, church, and community volunteering (2.5%), and college club and community volunteering (1.7%). Other combinations of extracurricular activities drew just one participant for each, and totaled 4% of the participants.

Instruments

The participants were asked to complete a demographic survey and three questionnaires to examine academic self-efficacy, cultural congruity, life satisfaction, academic motivation, and competing time demands. The instruments used included: (a) College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES), (b) Cultural Congruity Scale (CCS), and (c) Life satisfaction and Academic Motivation Questionnaire (LSAM). Each of the instruments is discussed below.

The demographic survey (See Appendix B) had ten multiple-choice and four fill-in-the-blank items. The survey asked for demographic information including age, gender, marital status, living situation, and number of children (if any). In addition, questions were asked about employment status, hours worked per week, and extracurricular activities. The students self-reported on their current GPA, along with the number of credit hours they were currently taking, and if they are the first in their family to attend college. Ethnicity, native language, and literacy in their native language were used to document the ESL characteristics of the participants in this study.

College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES)

Owen and Fromen (1988) designed this 33-item questionnaire (See Appendix C) which was piloted by undergraduate university students majoring in education and psychology. It was developed without hierarchical composition and utilizes a five-point Likert-type response ranging from (1) *Very Little Confidence, (2) Somewhat Unconfident, (3) Undecided, (4) Somewhat Confident* and (5) *Quite a lot of Confidence*. *CASES is* scored by calculating the mean score. This helped account for any questions that the participants omitted.

The instrument was selected for this study because it investigates feelings of academic self-efficacy across all subject areas. Reliability for *CASES* was established by using a test-retest method (Ayiku, 2005). To accomplish this, the scale was administered twice, over an eight-week period, to 88 undergraduate psychology students. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency reliability. At the conclusion of the study, alpha was estimated at .85. In regards to validity this instrument was establish by

two separate studies that used grade point averages along with the collected instrument data to look for incremental validity. Factorial validity was established using another sample of 122 students who rated the difficulty of performing the tasks stated in the *CASES* instrument (Ayiku, 2005).

A factor analysis was performed for the 33 items in the *CASES* survey. The new factor structure contained eight factors or scales: (a) active student participation, (b) course mastery, (c) professor's expectations, (d) classroom behaviors, (e) study skills, (f) application of prior knowledge, (g) written communication, and (h) math mastery. The factor loadings of the items ranged from 1.16 to 9.55 and each item had its highest loading fall in the factor. The eigenvalues of the eight factors were above 1.16 and the total variance explained by these scales was approximately 67% (see Table 3). Thus, the construct validity of the instrument was supported. Table 4 shows sample items for each of the *CASES* scales.

The *Cronbach's alpha* reliability coefficients of the scales ranged from .725 to .843 with a mean value of .791, suggesting that the eight scales are reliable in measuring college students' academic self-efficacy. Table 5 presents the alpha reliability coefficients and inter-scale correlations of the scales. Although the inter-scale correlation coefficients show that a few scales were moderately ($r > .30$) correlated with other scales, the mean inter-scale correlation coefficients of one scale with the other scales ranged from .127 to .459 with an overall average of .267. This suggests that the instrument has adequate discriminant validity and that each scale measures an aspect of college students' academic self-efficacy.

Cultural Congruity Scale (CCS)

This 13-item scale (See Appendix D) was developed by Gloria and Kurpius (1996) by combining the six-item *Perceived Threat Scale* developed by Ethier and Deaux (1990) with seven additional items they perceived as important from their own experiences as a racial/ethnic student and as a professor mentoring racial/ethnic students. The resulting CCS was designed to measure Chicano/a students' sense of acculturation within the college setting. The scale employs a five-point Likert-type response format ranging from (1) *Not at All, (2) Rarely, (3) Undecided, (4) Most of the Time and* (5) *A Great Deal*. Each participant was asked to rate the extent to which he or she has experienced the feeling or situation full-time at college. Eight of the questionnaire items were written so that they were reverse-scored to minimize the possibility of a response set. A cultural congruity score was obtained by summing across the responses.

This instrument was chosen to measure ESL college students' sense of cultural congruity or cultural fit within the community college. Reliability from the piloted instrument produced a Cronbach's alpha of .89. Subsequent study of Chicano/a students at two major universities in the southwest found internal consistency reliability for one group of 158 students to be .82, and the other group of 285 students to have a coefficient alpha of .80. This scale was validated with the same two samples of Chicano/a students using a regression equation to predict academic persistence. The Cronbach's alpha was found to be .84 (Gloria & Kurpius, 1996).

A factor analysis was performed for the 13 items in the *CCS* survey. The new factor structure contained four factors: (a) identity conflict, (b) perceived acceptance, (c)

cultural conflict, and (d) relationships. The factor loadings of the items ranged from 1.12 to 4.63 and each item had its highest loading fall in the factor. The eigenvalues of the four factors were above 1.12 and the total variance explained by these scales was approximately 70% (see Table 6). Thus, the construct validity of the instrument was supported. Table 7 shows sample items for each of the *CCS* scales.

The *Cronbach's alpha* reliability coefficients of the scales ranged from .641 to .837 with a mean value of .744, suggesting that the four scales are reliable in measuring college students' cultural congruity. Table 8 presents the alpha reliability coefficients and inter-scale correlations of the scales. Although the inter-scale correlation coefficients show that a few scales were moderately ($r > .30$) correlated with other scales, the mean inter-scale correlation coefficients of one scale with the other scales ranged from -.104 to .338 with an overall average of .089. This suggests that the instrument has adequate discriminant validity and that each scale measures an aspect of college students' cultural congruity.

Life Satisfaction and Academic Motivation Questionnaire (LSAM)

Academic motivation and life satisfaction was measured by means of an adaptation of a questionnaire first developed by Hammer, Grigsby, and Woods (1998). The same questionnaire was also used by Kirby, Biever, Martinez, and Gomez (2004) in a later study of university students attending a weekend college. Kirby, et al. adapted the questionnaire to include the name of the weekend college in several of the items. The questionnaire contains 26 items and three open-ended questions (See Appendix E). The researcher's adaptations included removal of the college referred to in the adaptation by

Kirby, et al. and the inclusion of a five-point Likert-type response format ranging from (1) *Not at All, (2) Rarely, (3) Undecided, (4) Most of the Time and* (5) *A Great Deal* for the first 26 items on the questionnaire. The three open-ended questions asked the participant to briefly comment on how going to school has impacted each of these: (a) family life, (b) work life, and (c) social life.

This questionnaire was used in this study because it provided data about the role conflict of balancing work, school, and family obligations and how this impacts (both positively and negatively) academic motivation and life satisfaction. Hammer et al. (1998) discovered an internal consistency reliability estimate of .87 in their original study. In the modified instrument used by Kirby et al. (2004), reliability was found to be at the .70 level.

A factor analysis was performed for the 13 items in the *LSAM* survey. The new factor structure contained six factors: (a) competing time demands, (b) benefits of school attendance, (c) family and school conflict, (d) family and school congruence, (e) school impact on family life, and (f) emotional impact of school. The factor loadings of the items ranged from 1.08 to 7.71 and each item had its highest loading fall in the factor. The eigenvalues of the six factors were above 1.08 and the total variance explained by these scales was approximately 68% (see Table 9). Thus, the construct validity of the instrument was supported. Table 10 shows sample items for each of the *LSAM* scales.

The *Cronbach's alpha* reliability coefficients of the scales ranged from .630 to .899 with a mean value of .771, suggesting that the six scales are reliable in measuring college students' life satisfaction and academic motivation. Table 11 presents the alpha

reliability coefficients and inter-scale correlations of the scales. Although the inter-scale correlation coefficients show that a few scales were moderately ($r > .30$) correlated with other scales, the mean inter-scale correlation coefficients of one scale with the other scales ranged from -.208 to .550 with an overall average of -.039. This suggests that the instrument has adequate discriminant validity and that each scale measures an aspect of college students' academic motivation and life satisfaction.

Data Collection

ESL community college students attending the first summer session and the fall semester (2011) at MCC were invited to participate in the study. The researcher asked permission to provide a brief information session to each summer and fall class held by the Department of Child Development and Teacher Education. During the information session, the researcher provided the prospective participants with information about the study. Students interested in participating were asked to provide their e-mail addresses, so that additional information could be provided about the time and place for the administration of the instruments. Students were provided with several options for sessions to complete the instruments. For example there were three data collection sessions each semester; one in the morning, afternoon, and evening.

An open classroom was used to administer the instruments at a time selected by the student. At the administration session the researcher provided participants with packets containing all four instruments. They were given pencils to write on the instruments which were completed in one sitting of approximately 20 minutes. The researcher responded to questions generated during the survey completion process. The

participants submitted the completed instruments to a collection box set up in the classroom. All responses were anonymous.

Data Analysis

The present study used a mixed-methods approach by examining both the quantitative measures from the three scales as well as the qualitative open-ended responses in one of the instruments. Data analysis included several steps. First, the researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze the data for the three instruments. Second, the researcher conducted a factor analysis for the quantitative items in each of the aforementioned surveys to determine the scales that were used as dependent variables in this study. Third, t-tests were conducted to investigate the significant differences between successful students and less successful students on academic self-efficacy, cultural congruity, level of life satisfaction, and academic motivation. A value of $p < .05$ was used as a measure of significance. Lastly, the open-ended responses in the LSAM survey were transcribed and color-coded to categorize and extract themes in regards to how going to school has impacted either positively or negatively the student's family life, work life, and social life. The researcher read and reviewed the responses multiple times to search for themes from the findings that emerged across participants' responses and looked for words or phrases to identify those themes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Academic Self-Efficacy

The first question of this study asked if there were significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on academic self-efficacy. Results are based on the overall means and standard deviations for each of the academic self-efficacy scales based on the students' confidence level. The data in Table 5 reports the overall means and standard deviations for the academic self-efficacy. Results from the survey indicated that ESL college students scored higher on the following academic self-efficacy scales: (a) professor's expectations *(M* = 4.25, *SD* = .710), (b) course mastery (*M* = 4.05, *SD* = .739) and (c) study skills (*M* = 3.70, *SD* = .755). Results also showed that these students scored lower on these scales: (a) application of prior knowledge *(M* = 3.54, *SD* = .905), (b) active student participation (*M* = 3.41, *SD* = .759), and (c) written communication *(M* = 3.20, *SD* = .1.134). In general, the standard deviations indicate moderate variability on the most and least cited self-efficacy scales.

Results from the t-test for academic self-efficacy (see Table 12) showed that successful students scored significantly higher (*p*= .046) on their confidence level about professor's expectations (*M* = 4.37, *SD* = .609) than less successful students (*M* = 4.10, *SD* = .796). However, there were no significant differences between successful and less successful students on their confidence level about active student participation, course

mastery, classroom behaviors, study skills, application of prior knowledge, written communication, and math mastery. There are no other statistically significant findings.

Cultural Congruity

The second question of this study asked if there were significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students' sense of cultural congruity. Results are based on the overall means and standard deviations for each of the cultural congruity scales based on the extent to which the student has experienced the feeling or situation in college. The data in Table 8 reports the overall means and standard deviations for cultural congruity. Results from the survey indicated that ESL college students scored higher on the following cultural congruity scales: (a) relationships *(M* = 4.05, *SD* = 1.041), and (b) perceived acceptance (*M* = 3.86, *SD*=.827). Results also showed that these students scored lower on these scales: (a) identity conflict *(M* = 2.04, *SD* = 1.018), and (b) cultural conflict (*M* = 1.63, *SD* = .791). In general, the standard deviations indicate moderate variability on the most and least cited cultural congruity scales.

Results from the t-test for cultural congruity (see Table 13) showed that successful students scored significantly higher (*p*= .026) on their experience with identity conflict (*M* = 2.23, *SD* = 1.105) than less successful students (*M* = 1.82, *SD* = .859). However, there were no significant differences between successful and less successful students on the following scales: (a) perceived acceptance, (b) cultural conflict, and (c) relationships. There are no other statistically significant findings.

Academic Motivation and Life Satisfaction

The third question of this study asked if there were significant differences between successful students (i.e., higher GPA) and less successful students on the level of academic motivation and life satisfaction. Results are based on the overall means and standard deviations for each of the academic motivation and life satisfaction scales based on the extent to which the student has experienced the feeling or situation in college. The data in Table 11 reports the overall means and standard deviations for life satisfaction and academic motivation. Results from the survey indicated that ESL college students scored higher on the following academic motivation and life satisfaction scales: (a) family and school congruence *(M* = 4.45, *SD* = .657), and (b) benefits of school attendance (*M* = 3.91, *SD* = .806). Results also showed that these students scored lower on these scales: (a) competing time demands *(M* = 2.13, *SD* = .883), and (b) family and school conflict (*M* = 1.94, *SD* = .828). In general, the standard deviations indicate moderate variability on the most and least cited life satisfaction and academic motivation scales.

Results from the t-test for academic motivation and life satisfaction (see Table 14) showed that there were no significant differences between successful and less successful students on the following scales: (a) competing time demands, (b) benefits of school attendance, (c) family and school conflict, (d) family and school congruence, (e) school impact on family life, and (f) emotional impact of school. There are no other statistically significant findings.

The fourth question of this study asked about the impact that going to college has on ESL students' family life, work life, and social life. Results are based on what students reported in their open-ended responses of the *LSAM.* The majority of the participants (107 out of 118) answered the qualitative questions. Overall, there were more positive remarks in all areas than there were negative responses. It is important to note that the student responses were transcribed exactly as they were written by the students even though some contained English mechanics and grammatical errors.

Family life

Positive comments abounded in regards to the impact of attending college on the students' family lives. Table 15 shows sample responses from the open-ended items focusing on the impact of going to college on students' family life. Eighty four (78.5%) of the 107 respondents were happy about the influence of their college attendance on their families. For example, one student responded, "Brought my family closer. They are proud of me." Another stated, "Me and my partner both are in school and to this point yes I feel it has open more doors to us to live a better well educated life to give my daughter a better brighter future." One respondent also mentioned the effect on the next generation when she stated, "I have learn to communicate with my family better as well as give great education advice to my daughter – (great examples)."

Pride, in their college attendance and academic accomplishments, was the theme mentioned most often by these participants. Eighteen (16.82%) of these teacher education and child development majors stated comments such as, "I feel very proud of myself because I can help my family and other people when they need advice on how to

work with children." Mentioned more often than intrinsic pride was the pride that family members had voiced, for example, "My husband is proud to say his wife is getting a higher education." Both participants' siblings and children were significant disseminators of pride. One respondent living at home said, "My mom is very proud as well as my siblings. I feel I am an example for my younger siblings." A college-student mother stated, "When my children looking at me that I'm going to school they feel so proud of me and they are more confident to going to school."

Several of these ESL college students commented on the fact that they are the first ones in their families to attend college. This evoked declarations of pride from many of the participants. As one student stated, "I will be the first one in my family working for a degree! They are happy am attending college." Another respondent talked about the possible influence on her siblings because of her choice to attend college at MCC, "It has been a great accomplishment since I am the oldest of my siblings and the first to go to college, and graduate this semester from college." Many times, parents do not know how to support their child in college if they themselves have not attended college. Some of these students, however, did have parental support. For example, one respondent wrote, "My parents have become much closer even though we were already close. They support me in my studies and make sure that I have everything I need to succeed. As the first one in my household to go to college, they always make sure to let me know how proud they are."

Another positive theme reported by about 10% of the ESL college students was happiness, which extended, more often than not, beyond themselves to their families. As

one student stated, “School is the main focus with my immediate family. Nothing, not even happiness comes before school.” Another mentioned the future benefits to the student and possibly to the family: “My family feel happy because I was educate and have a good future life.”

In addition, two more positive trends noted in the responses about family/college life were the excitement over being able to help children and younger siblings with homework and the desire to get a higher education. Becoming a role model for family members and helping family members were also recurring themes in students’ responses, 10.28% and 6.54% respectively. As one respondent stated, “I help to my children for their homework. It really work. They happy with that. My major is Math and most child need help about this subject.” One respondent spoke of her ability to be a role model for her family members now that she is enrolled in college. She said, “It has impacted my family by being an example to my sisters and also to my own children. I have teenagers and you don’t know how much I tell them about the importance of them going to college and getting an education career to better themselves and their future families. Due to the experiences I’ve had. I didn’t get to graduate from high school so I had to get my GED and then that’s where I hopped on the wagon to better my education.” Another stated, “Going to school have encouraged other family member to continue their education as well.”

Many of the positive comments about family life and the mesh with going to college had to do with intangible aspects such as being supportive (15.89%) or becoming a better communicator (2.80%). For example, one respondent stated, “Taking classes at

MCC has inspired my ability to communicate with others both in writing and oral." Another noted, "My children…learn about new subjects and we have more subjects to talk about." A father of one said, "I think, I can be more supportive parent & husband now that I am attending to college."

Likewise, future goals were often intangible ones like having a better life. Several students reported having a better future (5.61%) as one of their goals. One student who has already set her goals said, "Going to school has helped bring about structure and set goals in my life for myself and betterment for my family." An international student mentioned, "My family like me go to US to study they are so happy because I can help them run their business in the future." Another said, "I can give to my family better life, social, emotional and economic."

Negative comments about how going to school has impacted ESL students' family life were asserted by 14.02% of the respondents. Not surprisingly, most of them commented that attending school interfered with family time or events. Most of the comments about time had to do with having less than the desired amount of time to spend with their children. For instance one student reported, "Sometimes it takes time from me spending time with my baby girls. Trying to make time for them and my school work. Sometimes stay up late studying & I get very irritable or very tired, the next day or throughout the week." Another stated, "I am a mother of two children and it is a little difficult to combine both duties together. Especially because I work as well. Sometimes I feel I don't give my family the time they need and sometimes I realize the only reason I am going to school is to provide my family a better future."

Some of these students have seamlessly worked college attendance into their lives. These students stated that taking classes had no impact on their family lives (6.54%). As one student said, “I am blessed to have my children in school, my husband at work while I attend school. Practically they don’t miss me at all.” Others wrote about their families living far from MCC. One wrote, “My family lives in Turkey. I’m here in Houston alone. I miss them and visit them at least 2 times a year. I have a great family.”

In short, the impact of attending college on the students’ family lives was predominantly positive according to more than three-fourths of the respondents. They reported positive trends including pride, happiness, being a role model, helping family members, having a supportive family, becoming a better communicator, and having hopes for a better future. The only negative trend that was reported was not having the desired amount of time to spend with family. A few participants mentioned that college has not made an impact on their family life.

Work life

Positive remarks about the work/school relationship were voiced by 37.38% of the respondents. Table 16 shows sample responses from the open-ended items focusing on the impact of going to college on students’ work life. These participants were asked to briefly comment on how going to school has impacted their work life. It is relevant to note that 26.16% of students reported that they were not employed at the time of the survey and 5.60% did not provide a response.

While 14.95% of the college students stated that their jobs had no impact on their college life, many of the study participants commented on how going to school had

improved their work performance in their current positions, and some commented that they have hoped that having a college education will help them with jobs that they obtain in the future. Some examples of the students' responses included comments such as: (a) "The knowledge that that have obtain by taking classes at MCC has open more opportunities for me," (b) "More people call me to babysit their children which is great," and (c) "I may get a better job. Education is so important. I will be a more productive worker." Most of the college students had employers who supported their efforts to get a degree. As one student summed it up, "My manager speaks and thinks of me highly because she knows I am trainable with a higher education."

One positive trend reported by a large number of students (18.69%) was the ability to apply the skills and knowledge learned in their college classes to their work. These responses contained details of how taking these classes had enhanced their work life. One student succinctly said, "What I learn at school, I use at work." Another stated, "I am a better co-worker, a great team player, better communicator, public speaker & Teacher working with young children." One participant stated, "I have work in education for the last 7 years & going to school has helped me be better & more professional at the work I do as Teacher Assistant. Now working in intervention and special education." Another noted, "I work as a teacher/babysitter at my church. Coming to school and learning how children grow and develop has really helped me be a better educator." Here is one student's comment: "It has also impacted my work life because it has allowed me to maintain the position that I have as a teacher assistant and in the future to be a teacher. It has allowed me to know and learn more about the

development of children and their growth how each one of them is different in their own way. I love my job and it's not because of the pay its just that I have a passion for kids and their families who at times need someone to hear them out."

Another positive theme that emerged from the participants' responses was how their college attendance opened up career opportunities for their future. Almost 20% suggested that taking courses at MCC has improved their job performance. For example, one student stated, "School has impacted my work in a good way by expanding my knowledge on things such as Spanish and allow me to communicate more better with the only Spanish speakers at my job the right way." Another one said that she had learned more English by attending MCC which in turn helped her at work. She said, "I improve my English so I can understand better in every aspect."

Although the majority of the participants reported that going to college positively impacted their work life, about 16% expressed negative comments about the impact of going to school and maintaining employment. The focus of most of the comments was on homework both from college and from the workplace. For example, one stated, "I have to use personal days to complete observation assignments…" One student summed up the homework dilemma by saying, "I always think about homeworks assignments when I'm at work." One student solved the school/work problem by giving up the job. She said, "I use to have a job and going to school and work is difficult. So I chose to just stay in school." However, not all of the students in the study had the luxury of quitting their jobs or trimming their work hours. As one student said, "It is hard to juggle studying and scheduling classes with working enough have to support myself." One

student summed up the difficulties of balancing school and work by saying, “Made me a little tired at work, I feel that I could spend more time on school work and a little less time on working.”

Overall, these ESL college students reported a positive relationship between school and work. Many of them acknowledged that they could apply the skills and knowledge that they acquired in their college classes to their jobs and that these academic experiences would have a positive impact on their future. Some students had difficulty balancing the time between school and work and thus reported negative comments about their experiences. Other students conveyed that going to college had no impact on their work life.

Social life

Almost half of the participants (46.72%) gave a positive response to the query about the impact of going to school on their social life. Table 17 shows sample responses from the open-ended items focusing on the impact of going to college on students’ social life. Meeting people and making new friends was a popular theme expressed by a large number of students (22.43%). One student voiced the practicality of making friends at college. She said, “My friends are mostly in college and we support each other. If I have a class question I know who I can ask.” Many of the study participants commented on the diversity inherent in their classes. One said, “I meet new people from all over the world from different backgrounds.” Another student voiced similar thoughts when she said, “I meet new people from different backgrounds, and I learned from them and some of their experiences.”

Personal benefits of socializing with classmates were also mentioned when a student said, “Before, I started classes at MCC, I was shy and solitary person. Now I have more friends and I even can talk at my church in front of everybody. Also my Pastor put me in charge of the children Bible studies.” Another student said, “I have been able to meet people that share the same interest & work in the same field as I do. Additionally I have been able to share with family & friends what I have learned within the last 8 months.” One suggested that MCC has delivered benefits beyond socialization when she stated, “My social life has expanded a lot. I am able to help and feel confident in delivering information to my friends who have children.”

Another positive theme that emerged from the responses of a large number of students (16.86%) was how their social life improved after enrolling in college. For instance, a student said, “School has impacted my social life in a good way, by expanding my vocabulary so I can talk more knowledgeable,” and someone else concurred by saying, “I like to stay at school and talk with people at school. This way helps me to study second language.” The cultural richness was not wasted on another student who said, “My social life is improved because I have so many subjects to discuss! Current themes in our culture and politics that I would not otherwise be observing and analyzing. It makes for great discussions and conversations!”

A few of the students (7.47%) mentioned having supportive friends who understood that they had college related time constraints. They also mentioned the importance of making time to engage in friendships. One respondent had worked out a system for when she could socialize and she stated, “I still have a social life but during

the week I don't go out due to homework and studying. My friends in my social circle also apply the same education ethics so it works out." Likewise, another one stated, "I'm a social person. I love lots of foreign friends in Houston. We always hang out in my free times." Electronics helped this college student stay-in-touch: "I used the cell to said Hi! to most of my friends. I love the life I have."

While many of the study participants cited attending school as having a positive impact on their social life, a large number of ESL community college students (27.10%) expressed that going to school had negatively impacted their lives. For example, a student stated, "I don't have a social life." Many of the responses to the query about social life were stoic ones such as, "Well I never had a social life so it doesn't affect me," or "I don't do much social interaction. Because my family and friends are in Korea." Another stated, "It has taken up much of my time but I'd rather be in school and enjoy my life later." Continuing with the focus on time management, another student said, "Well, I have a shorter weekend and less time to spend with my family and friends. My extra time I do housework duties and work duties." Many of the responses acknowledged a lack of perceived social life, but gave a rationale about why this was happening. For example, a student voiced this rationale, "This area is one that I have to be better. I still keep my friends from my country and keep communication with them through email." Others were willing to compromise for the sake of getting an education. As one student said, "School of course requires a lot of studying and dedication but I want to succeed and make my parents and family proud so I am willing to sacrifice hanging out with friends."

In addition, the time that working on assignments for college takes was a common theme. An example is, “Taken away time from social life. I spend most of my time working on assignments before deadline.” Two of the respondents discussed the pitfalls of making and maintaining friendships while attending college. One stated, “…I have made new friends while attending MCC classes and I have learned about other cultures. However, on the other hand, since I am a very disciplined person and I like to get good grades, I spend most of my time reading and doing homework, so I have no time to go out with friends or visit my relatives because of my school obligations…” The other respondent lost some friends because of her college attendance, but this student ended her writing on a positive note. She said, “Friends sometimes get upset, because I dont hang out with them as much, due to me having a lot of homework. Ive lost friends due to school, but Ive made new friends as well because of school.”

Some ESL college students (14.95%) thought that attending college had little or no impact on their social life. As one put it, “My social life has not really impacted my school may be just a little but not a great deal. I keep my social life separate from my school life.” Rationalization was commonplace as in, “I like to go out but only to a few places, so it doesn’t interfere with my work or school,” and “All my friends go here as well so no concerns or problems.” While another knew exactly how to handle any social life/college conflict: “Not much, if I have a paper of have to study, I’ll ask my friends to study with me or their papers with me while we hang out at Starbucks or Barnes & Noble.”

In sum, almost half of the participants reported that going to school has had a positive impact in their lives. Some of the positive themes mentioned included meeting and making new friends, improving their social skills, as well as making time to spend with their friends and having a supportive circle of friends. However, a large number of students reported that going to college hindered their social lives because of limited time while a few students mentioned that it has not impacted their lives.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study can provide recommendations for advisors and professors working with first-year ESL community college students. Results from the *College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES)* indicated that ESL community college students understand the expectations of their professors, and that they are able to master the coursework using their study skills. Prior research supports that self-efficacy can act as a buffer to help absorb some of the stress inherent in the first-year experience of an ESL community college student (Solberg, et al., 1993; Zell, 2010).

In addition, self-efficacy and student attitude can influence how much, and in what ways, students engage with the campus environment. It is important to note that the successful ESL college students, as measured by higher GPA, scored significantly higher on their confidence level about professors' expectations than less successful students. Perhaps ESL community college students understand the expectations of their professors, and they are able to master the coursework using their study skills.

Since successful ESL college students often have good rapport with their professors (Gan, Humphreys, & Hamp-Lyons, 2004), this implies that training faculty in classroom engagement strategies for the ESL student is warranted. For instance, community college faculty could use more learner-centered instruction techniques such as grouping the students for discussions and providing clearer expectations. At the college level, the administration can create faculty professional development that

addresses the unique learning needs of ESL students. Maybe college professors could participate in trainings similar to what classroom teachers receive in the state for ESL certification purposes. The college could also provide study skills training for less successful students (i.e., student success courses, free tutoring).

Prior research has indicated that successful students use multiple strategies to practice English, and maintain a good rapport with their English teachers (Morales & Blau, 2009; Hagedorn, et al., 2007; Gan, et al., 2004; Cheng & Fox, 2008). Further steps that community colleges could take to break linguistic barriers to success include offering accessible tutoring in English mechanics and grammar.

In regards to ESL college students' beliefs about college life at MCC, results from the *Cultural Congruity Scale (CCS)* showed that the ESL college students scored higher on relationships and perceived acceptance, and lower on identity conflict and cultural conflict. This may be linked to students doing better if they have a social group of students from similar cultural backgrounds and/or make friends with college students brought up in the American culture. This suggests that possibly these students have connected with their professors and classmates since they tend to enroll in the same classes within the Teacher Education and Child Development Department. To further facilitate these positive experiences for students, colleges can implement campus advising to help students learn to make use of family and cultural support systems (i.e., international student office, Hispanic student club).

Furthermore, the successful students scored significantly higher on their experience with identity conflict than the less successful students. Perhaps these students

have immersed themselves more in the college experience and have interacted more with their non-ESL college classmates. This could be due to the fact that self-efficacy and student attitude can influence how much, and in what ways, students engage with the campus environment. For example, community college professors and/or departments could build on students' strengths to facilitate assimilation into the academic environment by organizing student clubs in a specific content area and/or providing field trip opportunities. This finding corroborates previous research conducted with Mexican American college students in which social support was an important predictor of students' college adjustment (Solberg, et al., 1993).

Results from the *Life Satisfaction and Academic Motivation Questionnaire (LSAM)* showed that MCC students' lives were substantially impacted by attending college. The impact on these ESL community college students was both positive and negative. Both the Likert-type responses and the three open-ended responses to this portion of the questionnaire focused on the stress inherent in combining work, family, and school.

Overall, the ESL college students scored higher on family and school congruence and the benefits of school attendance, while they scored lower on competing time demands and family and school conflict. These were perhaps factors that contributed to their success. Although there were no significant differences by GPA on the survey results, the qualitative results from the open-ended items showed that the ESL student's family, work, and social life all play a part in college success. These findings validate a

study conducted by Reynolds and Weigand (2010) that found no relationship between academic motivation and GPA.

In regards to family and school congruence, the influence of college attendance on the students' family life was a positive one. To make this connection stronger, colleges could possibly institute coursework where students acquire problem solving and time management skills. For example, they can offer as a student success course where students can learn how to manage their weekly schedules. Colleges could also offer a job preparation course where students learn to dress professionally, get ready for interviews, and prepare resumes. Additionally, colleges could plan activities that can include families, provide childcare on campus to facilitate students' college attendance, and provide service learning opportunities within the surrounding community.

The students with positive outcomes in their responses mentioned attending school as an opportunity for them to become a role model for family members. They also reported that their newly acquired problem solving and time management skills were having a positive impact on their family life. Research shows that many students have to balance family commitments with the pursuit of a college education (Castillo, et al., 2004). This balancing act was mentioned by many of the study respondents; though the majority of them self-reported that the influence of college attendance on their family life was a positive one. Another study conducted by Kirby et al., (2004) with the *LSAM,* found that just 40% of their participants experienced a clash between college and family time. For those ESL college students who worked along with taking college classes, they mentioned that an increase in knowledge garnered them increased respect at work. They

also stated that they could often apply what was learned in their college courses to the work environment.

Negative responses to the influence of college attendance on these students' work life were more prevalent than positive comments. Prior research about the impact of school on work showed that course assignments should focus on the application of content to the student work situation (Kirby et al., 2004). Many of the study participants were working in their chosen field already. The present findings suggest that taking classes in the field that a person is already working in has been shown by these ESL students to have a broad influence at the work site.

Overall, open-ended responses indicated that ESL college students' social lives were positively impacted by developing their social skills and having supportive friends. However, a large number of students reported having difficulty balancing their time to include a social life. It could be that the students that were positively impacted have immersed themselves more in the college experience and have interacted more with their non-ESL college classmates. Therefore, colleges can encourage campus socialization between ESL college students with similar majors, interests, and classes. For instance, professors should include small group activities in class so students have more opportunities to interact. Colleges can promote student participation in extracurricular activities, online discussions, and memberships in student clubs based on their major. Earlier research shows that ESL college students do better if they have a social group of students from similar cultural backgrounds and/or make friends with college students brought up in American culture (Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998). Findings suggest that

socializing with new acquaintances who share similar majors, interests, and classes could be a way that some of the study participants have become involved in campus life.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. First, the selection bias for the participants needs to be addressed. Participants included undergraduate ESL college student volunteers who were enrolled in the for-credit classes in one community college. Second, the participants included students in the classes taught by the researcher and other faculty members in the Teacher Education and Child Development Department. Third, this study was conducted in a large, urban community college. It is possible that the results of this study are more unique and characteristic of such an environment. Therefore, the results might not be relevant in a rural community college, or one in another quadrant of the United States. Characteristics common to this urban setting include high levels of literacy, low levels of unemployment, moderate levels of educational attainment, a diversity population, and low levels of income. Thus the results should be interpreted with caution and not generalized to the overall ESL college student population at MCC as well as in other higher education programs.

Fourth, this study relied on self-reported data from volunteer ESL community college students who were asked to read a rather lengthy set of questionnaires. In fact, a few student questionnaires were unusable because they were incomplete. For example, if the incomplete portions were at the end of the document, then perhaps the college students could have ran out of time or stamina to complete the task. Fifth, some

terminology on the questionnaires, while more common to native-English speakers, was less well-known to the ESL student. One example was the word "dull" as in the survey item *"Attending class consistently in a dull course."* This could have been misleading or misinterpreted by some of the participants if they were not advanced in English. Other items were not specific enough, and for example, asked the respondent to make judgment calls about whether or not a class was large or small.

Sixth, the self-reporting of grade point averages also needs to be discussed. Several students were unsure of their exact GPA, and so they rounded to the nearest number. Others were in their first semester at MCC and had not yet accrued a GPA. These students' questionnaires were subsequently removed from the study, as GPA data was necessary to answer the research questions.

Seventh, the high percentage of negative responses on the qualitative section of the *LSAM* may have been due to the fact that the 26 Likert-type response items focused more on family and work situations than on the students' social life. So, the study participants were in affect given examples of what kinds of short-answer responses that they could use for the family and work sections, but they were left without a definition of what might be a short answer response to the question about their social life. Adding credence to this hypothesis is that fewer study participants filled out the short-answer question about their social life, and many of those who responded did not elaborate.

Future Research

Increased immigration demands that further study be done on the acculturation of immigrant, bilingual and foreign students to facilitate their success in college. This is

especially important given the high numbers of students who begin their college studies at a community college. It is imperative that we help ESL students thrive in our community colleges. These students need to be supported while they learn to make use of family, cultural, and institutional resources to navigate the barriers that have traditionally been in their way as they strive for academic success. Community colleges can recognize and enhance their students' strengths rather than simply expecting them to assimilate into the academic environment. Future research could focus on ways that educators can help ESL students gain the knowledge necessary for academic success as well as examine if campus ethnic composition changes the students' ethnic identity.

Future studies could be conducted using the three questionnaires used in the present study with a larger sample of ESL college students who are enrolled in other departments to determine if there are differences or similarities across the community college. A larger scale study could also be done with students from other community colleges in the state and with non-ESL students to compare students' success factors among the two populations.

Little research has been compiled on the benefits of using computer technology with the ESL community college student. Future research could examine the acculturation affects and academic self-efficacy that computer technologies such as online classes, web-enhanced classes, or social-media sites such as Facebook have on the ESL community college student.

We need to know how professors affect student success in community colleges. More research is needed to determine specific ways in which relationships with

professors affect students' success. These relationships are an important factor affecting students' academic self-efficacy, acculturation to college, and academic motivation. Further research could show faculty members how to invite students into supportive relationships in more intentional ways.

Researchers could assist community colleges by developing research-based surveys that can be used to conduct a needs assessment. This could help colleges to find out what kind of professional development professors may be lacking in regards to using teaching strategies that promote the success of ESL college students. It is not only important to find out the deficiencies, but also to implement trainings to address these. Thus, professors could be better equipped to facilitate ESL college students' success.

REFERENCES

Al-Sharideh, K. A., & Goe, W. R. (1998). Ethnic communities within the university: An examination of factors influencing the personal adjustment of international students. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(6), 699-726.

Ayiku, T. Q. (2005). *The relationships among college self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and athletic self-efficacy for African American male football players* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Maryland, College Park.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Becerra, D. (2010). Differences in perceptions of barriers to college enrollment and the completion of a degree among Latinos in the United States. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 9*(2), 187-201.

Bosher, S., & Smalkoski, K. (2002). From needs analysis to curriculum development designing a course in health-care communication for immigrant students in the USA. *English for Specific Purposes, 21,* 59-79.

Brilliant, J. J. (2000). Issues in counseling immigrant college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24,* 577-586.

Buddington, S. A. (2002). Acculturation, psychological adjustment (stress, depression, self-esteem) and the academic achievement of Jamaican immigrant college student. *International Social Work, 45*(4), 447-464.

Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., & Brossart, D. F. (2004). Acculturation, White marginalization, and family support as predictors of perceived distress in Mexican American female college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*(2), 151-157.

Cheng, L., & Fox, J. (2008). Towards a better understanding of academic acculturation: Second language students in Canadian universities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 65*(2), 307-333.

Community College Advising (2009). Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse/advisingIssues/comcollege.htm

Conway, K. M. (2010). Educational aspirations in an urban community college: Differences between immigrant and native student groups. *Community College Review, 37*(3), 209-242.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education (Ed.), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Cummins, J. (1994). Primary language instruction and the education of language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework* (2nd ed.) (pp. 3-46). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Curry, M. J. (2004). UCLA community college review. Academic literacy for English language learners. *Community College Review, 32*(2), 51-66.

Dougherty, K. J. (1992). Community colleges and baccalaureate attainment. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(2), 188-214.

Ellis-O'Quinn, A. (2011). *An ex post facto study of first-year student orientation as an indicator of student success at a community college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3459677)

Ethier, K., & Deaux, K. (1990). Hispanics in Ivy: Assessing identity and perceived threat. *Behavioral Science, 22*(7-8), 427-440.

Fike, D. S., & Fike, R. (2008). Predictors of first-year student retention in the community college. *Community College Review, 36*(2), 68-88.

Fry, R., & Taylor, P. (2013). High school drop-out rate at record low: Hispanic high school graduates pass whites in rate of college enrollment. *Pew Research Hispanic Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/05/09/hispanic-high-school-graduates-pass-whites-in-rate-of-college-enrollment/

Gan, Z., Humphreys, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding successful and unsuccessful EFL students in Chinese universities. *The Modern Language Journal, 88,* 229-244.

Giancola, J. K., Grawitch, M. J., & Borchert, D. (2009). Dealing with the stress of college. *Adult Education Quarterly, 59*(3), 246-263.

Glass, C. R., Westmont, C. M. (2013). Comparative effects of belongingness on the academic success and cross-cultural interactions of domestic and international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Retrieved from www.elsevier.com/locate/ijintrel

Gloria, A. M., & Kurpius, S. F. R. (1996). The validation of the cultural congruity scale and the university environment scale with Chicano/a students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*(4), 533-549.

Gray, M. J., and Vernez, G. (1996). Student access and the 'new' immigrants. *Change, 28*(5), 40-48.

Gray, R., Vitak, J., Easton, E.W., & Ellison, N. B. (2013). *Examining social adjustment to college in the age of social media: Factors influencing successful transitions and persistence.* Computers & Education. Retrieved from www.elsevier.com/locate/compedu

Hagedorn, L. S., Chi, W., Cepeda, R. M., & McLain, M. (2007). An investigation of critical mass: The role of Latino representation in the success of urban community college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(1), 73-92.

Hammer, L. B., Grigsby, T. D., & Woods, S. (1998). The conflicting demands of work, family, and school among students at an urban university. *The Journal of Psychology, 132*, 220-226.

Huang, J. (2004). Voices from Chinese students: Professors' use of English affects academic listening. *College Student Journal, 38*(2), 212-224.

Huang, J. (2006). The effects of academic skills on Chinese ESL students' lecture comprehension (English-as-a-second-language). *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 385-393.

Illowsky, B. (2008). The California basic skills initiative. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 144,* 83-91.

Jiang, B., & Kuehn, P. (2001). Transfer in the academic language development of post-secondary ESL students. *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(4), 417-436.

Kever, J. (2010, May 23). Many students not ready for college, costing Texas $200M a year. *Houston Chronicle,* pp. A1, A3.

Kibler, A. K., Bunch, G. C., & Endris, A. K. (2011). Community college practices for U.S.-educated language-minority students: A resource-oriented framework. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 201-222.

Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for Specific Purposes, 25,* 479-489.

Kirby, P. G., Biever, J. L., Martinez, I. G., & Gomez, J. P. (2004). Adults returning to school: The impact on family and work. *The Journal of Psychology, 138*(1), 65-76.

Lee, K. S., and Carrasquillo, A. (2006). Korean college students in United States: Perceptions of professors and students. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 442-456.

Lunsford, A. A., Fishman, J., & Liew, W. M. (2013). College writing, identification, and the production of intellectual property: Voices from the Stanford study of writing. *College English, 75*(5), 470-494.

Mangan,K. (2013, March 13). Program offers a quicker path to college credit for students mired in remedial courses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U. S. college composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637-651.

McJunkin, K. S. (2005). Early intervention programs to increase persistence and retention at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29,* 163-167.

Midtown Community College Office of Institutional Research (2012). *2011-2012 Fact Book.* Retrieved from http://www.hccs.edu/hcc/images/homepageimages/0-HCC2011-2012FactBok.pdf

Midtown Community College Office of Institutional Research (2010). *Retention, student success, progression reports for 2010-2011.* Retrieved from http://www.hccs.edu/hcc/System%20Home/Departments/OIR/Reports/Reports_PDFs/retention_success_1011.pdf

Morales, B., and Blau, E. K. (2009). Identity issues in building an ESL community: The Puerto Rican experience. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 121*(2), 45-55.

National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). *Percentage distribution of undergraduates, by control and type of institution and student characteristics: 2003-04.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2008/analysis/sa_table.asp?tableID=1006.

Noonan-Terry, C. M., & Waiwaiole, E. (2008). Making a positive impact in students' lives: Along with implementing deliberate retention policies, hiring the right people to encourage students to persist in college is essential. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 25*(18), 35.

Orlov, L. (2005). *Language minority students: Bilingual identity development of language minority college students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Owen, S. V., & Froman, R. D. (1988). *Development of a college academic self-efficacy scale*. Paper presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED298158

Padilla, A. M., & Gonzalez, R. (2001). Academic performance of immigrant and U. S.-born Mexican heritage students: Effects of schooling in Mexico and bilingual/English language instruction. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 727-742.

Reynolds, A. L., & Weigand, M. J. (2010). The relationships among academic attitudes, psychological attitudes, and the first-semester academic achievement of first-year college students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 47*(2), 175-195.

Roman, M. A. (2007). Community college admission and student retention. *Journal of College Admission, 194,* 18-23.

Rubenstein, I. Z. (2006). Educational expectations: How they differ around the world: Implications for teaching ESL college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30,* 433-441.

Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilinguistic and Multicultural Development, 7*(5), 379-396.

Solberg, V. S., O'Brien, K., Villareal, P., Kennel, R., & Davis, B. (1993). Self-efficacy and Hispanic college students: Validation of the college self-efficacy instrument. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15*(1), 80-95.

Song, B. (2006). Failure in a college ESL course: Perspectives of instructors and students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*, 417-431.

Tietjen-Smith, T., Masters, S., Smith, H., & Waller, R. (2009). A national study of community college retention rates segmented by institutional degree of urbanization. Retrieved from *Academic Leadership:* http://www.academicleadership.org/student_research/611_printer.shtml

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Universities and Colleges in Texas. (2013). *Texas universities and colleges with the highest number of international students.* Retrieved from http://universitiesandcollegesintexas.com/

U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2007). *Information sharing could help institutions identify and address challenges some Asian Americans and Pacific Islander students face* (GAO-07-925). Retrieved from http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07925.pdf

Vinogradov, P., & Bigelow, M. (2010). Using oral language skills to build on the emerging literacy of adult English learners. *CAELA Network Brief.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/caelanetwork

Wright, E. L. (1998). The effects of academic language instruction on college-bound at-risk secondary students. *Journal of Educational Opportunity, 17*(1), 9-22.

Young, T. L. (2007). *Graduate students and stress: The positive and negative effects of significant relationships.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Zell, M. C. (2010). Achieving a college education: The psychological experiences of Latina/o community college students. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 9*(2), 167-186.

Zhou, Y, Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(1), 63-75.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 1

Percentages of Students in Terms of GPA, Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Native Language, and Literacy in the Native Language.

Variable		Percentage
GPA	2.00-2.99	44.9
	3.00-4.00	55.1
Age	18-22	27.1
	23-30	29.7
	31-36	11.9
	37-45	19.5
	46-55	10.2
	55+	1.7
Gender	Male	13.6
	Female	86.4
Ethnicity	White	6.0
	Black	3.4
	Hispanic	65.0
	Asian	23.1
	Other	2.6
Native language	Spanish	58.5
	Vietnamese	9.3
	Korean	1.7
	Urdu	2.5
	Turkish	1.7
	Tagalog	1.7
	English/Spanish	5.1
	Chinese/Taiwanese	1.7
	Arabic/English	1.7
	Cantonese, Farsi, Persian, Malayalam, Gujarati, Igbo, Kingyarwanda, Polish, American Sign Language, English/French, Ewe/French, English/Nigerian, German/Spanish, and French/Arabic	less than 1%
Literacy in the native language	Yes	86.4
	No	13.6

Table 2

Percentages of Students in Terms of Marital Status, Parenthood, Living Situation, First in Family to Attend College, Employment Status, Enrolled Hours, and Participation in Extracurricular Activities.

Variable		Percentage
Marital status	Single	50.8
	Married	33.1
	Divorced/separated	15.3
	Windowed	0.8
Parenthood	No children	54.2
	Children	45.8
Living situation	Lives with family members	70.3
	Lives alone	11.9
	Lives with significant other	11.9
	Lives with a friend or roommate	5.9
First in family to attend college	Yes	44.4
	No	66.6
Enrollment status	Part-time	59.0
	Full-time	41.0
Employment status	Not employed	34.8
	Part-time	16.5
	Full-time	48.7
Participation in extracurricular activities	Yes	74.6
	No	25.4

Table 3

Factor Loadings of CASES Scales

Item	Active Student Participation	Course Mastery	Professor's Expectations	Classroom Behaviors	Study Skills	Application of Prior Knowledge	Written Communication	Math Mastery
CASES14	.624							
CASES15	.527							
CASES16	.623							
CASES25	.715							
CASES27	.538							
CASES28	.531							
CASES1		.501						
CASES5		.648						
CASES20		.790						
CASES21		.748						
CASES26		.529						
CASES12			.434					
CASES17			.851					
CASES18			.721					
CASES23			.619					
CASES30			.635					
CASES2				.804				
CASES3				.834				
CASES4				.637				
CASES11				.466				
CASES13					.487			
CASES31					.753			
CASES32					.687			
CASES33					.650			
CASES8						.493		
CASES9						.803		
CASES10						.719		
CASES6							.782	
CASES7							.727	
CASES22								.755
CASES24								.882
Variance	28.95	8.96	8.35	5.26	4.72	4.02	3.67	3.51
Eigenvalue	9.55	2.96	2.75	1.74	1.56	1.33	1.21	1.16
Cronbach α	.786	.824	.817	.843	.766	.725	.831	.738

Table 4

Description of CASES Scales

Scale	Sample items
Active Student Participation	Participating in extracurricular events (sports, clubs). Making good use of the library.
Course Mastery	Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching). Relating course content to material in other courses.
Professor's Expectations	Earning good marks in most classes. Attending class regularly.
Classroom Behaviors	Participating in class discussions. Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don't understand.
Study Skills	Spreading out studying instead of cramming. Understanding difficult passages in textbooks.
Application of Prior Knowledge	Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic. Explaining a concept to another student.
Written Communication	Taking essay tests. Writing a high quality term paper.
Math Mastery	Performing simple math computations. Mastering most content in a math course.

Table 5

Alpha Reliability, Inter-Scale Correlation, Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of the CASES Scales

Scales	*Cronbach*	Inter-scale correlation								*Mean*	*SD*
	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Active Student Participation (1)	.786	__	.459**	.401**	.481**	.620**	.485**	.491**	.144	3.41	.759
Course Mastery (2)	.824	__	__	.616**	.597**	.480**	.587**	.407**	.390**	4.05	.739
Professor's Expectations (3)	.817	__	__	__	.394**	.530**	.339**	.222*	.459**	4.25	.710
Classroom Behaviors (4)	.843	__	__	__	__	.416**	.620**	.466**	.204*	3.63	1.016
Study Skills (5)	.766	__	__	__	__	__	.398**	.390**	.223*	3.70	.755
Application of Prior Knowledge (6)	.725	__	__	__	__	__	__	.514**	.324**	3.54	.905
Written Communication (7)	.831	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	.127	3.20	1.134
Math Mastery (8)	.738	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	3.59	1.012

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Means are based on a 5-point scale with 5= Quite a lot of confidence and 1= Very little confidence

Table 6

Factor Loadings of CCS Scales

Item	Identity Conflict	Perceived Acceptance	Cultural Conflict	Relationships
CCS1	.856			
CCS2	.840			
CCS3	.802			
CCS4	.664			
CCS11		.795		
CCS12		.823		
CCS13		.788		
CCS6			.486	
CCS7			.759	
CCS9			.675	
CCS10			.801	
CCS5				.852
CCS8				.824
Variance	35.59	15.78	9.99	8.65
Eigenvalue	4.63	2.05	1.30	1.12
Cronbach α	.837	.774	.727	.641

Table 7

Description of CCS Scales

Scale	Sample items
Identity Conflict	I feel that I have to change myself to fit in at school. I feel that my ethnicity or cultural background is incompatible with other students.
Perceived Acceptance	I feel accepted at this school. As a member of my ethnic or cultural group, I feel I belong on this campus.
Cultural Conflict	I feel I am leaving my family values behind by going to college. I feel that my language and/or appearance make it hard for me to fit in with other students.
Relationships	I can talk to my friends at school about my family and culture. I can talk to my family about my friends from school.

Table 8

Alpha Reliability, Inter-Scale Correlation, Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of the CCS Scales

Scales	*Cronbach*	Inter-scale correlation				*Mean*	*SD*
	α	1	2	3	4		
Identity Conflict (1)	.837	__	-.059	.517**	-.104	2.04	1.018
Perceived Acceptance (2)	.774	__	__	-.219*	.338**	3.86	.827
Cultural Conflict (3)	.727	__	__	__	-.173	1.63	.791
Relationships (4)	.641	__	__	__	__	4.05	1.041

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Means are based on a 5-point scale with 5=A great deal and 1= Not at all

Table 9

Factor Loadings of LSAM Scales

Item	Competing Time Demands	Benefits of School Attendance	Family and School Conflict	Family and School Congruence	School Impact on Family Life	Emotional Impact of School
LSAM15	.674					
LSAM16	.765					
LSAM17	.763					
LSAM15	.674					
LSAM19	.817					
LSAM20	.816					
LSAM21	.729					
LSAM22	.763					
LSAM19	.817					
LSAM13		.656				
LSAM14		.853				
LSAM18		.610				
LSAM23		.759				
LSAM26		.698				
LSAM7			.843			
LSAM8			.736			
LSAM 9			.400			
LSAM11			.614			
LSAM12			.638			
LSAM1				.743		
LSAM4				.699		
LSAM24				.791		
LSAM25				.700		
LSAM2					.647	
LSAM3					.805	
LSAM6					.725	
LSAM5						.581
LSAM10						.620
Vari-ance	29.65	14.73	8.32	5.86	4.84	4.16
Eigenvalue	7.71	3.83	2.16	1.52	1.26	1.08
Cronbach α	.899	.801	.816	.725	.756	.630

Table 10

Description of LSAM Scales

Scale	Sample items
Competing Time Demands	My class requirements often conflict with my work obligations. School demands often make me too tired to perform all aspects of my work.
Benefits of School Attendance	Going to school has benefitted my family. Going to school has benefitted my work.
Family and School Conflict	My family life takes up time that I would like to spend on doing my school work. My family life often conflicts with my class schedule.
Family and School Congruence	My family supports my educational goals. In general, how satisfied are you with your family life?
School Impact on Family Life	My family dislikes how often I am preoccupied with my school work while I am at home. My school demands make it difficult to be the kind of partner/spouse or parent I would like to be.
Emotional Impact of School	Because my school work is demanding, at times I am irritable at home. When I go to school, I am too tired to do some of the things I would like to do.

Table 11

Alpha Reliability, Inter-Scale Correlation, Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of the LSAM Scales

Scales	*Cronbach*	Inter-scale correlation						*Mean*	*SD*
	α	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Competing Time Demands (1)	.899	__	-.195	.522**	-.259*	.408**	.455**	2.13	.883
Benefits of School Attendance (2)	.801	__	__	-.187	.550**	-.082	-.208	3.91	.806
Family and School Conflict (3)	.816	__	__	__	-.181	.600**	.617**	1.94	.828
Family and School Congruence (4)	.725	__	__	__	__	-.050	-.071	4.45	.657
School Impact on Family Life (5)	.756	__	__	__	__	__	.586**	2.56	1.026
Emotional Impact of School (6)	.630	__	__	__	__	__	__	2.53	1.0886

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Means are based on a 5-point scale with 5=A great deal and 1= Not at all

Table 12

T-test Comparisons Between Successful Students and Less Successful Students on CASES Scales

		Successful Students (*n=65*)		Less Successful Students (*n* =53)			
Variable	*df*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*p* (2-tail)
Active Student Participation	113	3.38	.715	3.46	.813	.543	.588
Course Mastery	110	4.10	.724	3.98	.759	-.835	.405
Professor's Expectations	110	4.37	.609	4.10	.796	-2.021	.046*
Classroom Behaviors	115	3.65	1.002	3.61	1.043	-.228	.820
Study Skills	107	3.73	.748	3.65	.771	.516	.607
Application of Prior Knowledge	110	3.56	.910	3.52	.908	-.253	.801
Written Communication	114	3.10	1.131	3.32	1.138	1.019	.310
Math Mastery	112	3.73	.925	3.43	1.092	-1.565	.120

Note. *$p<.05$

Table 13

T-test Comparisons Between Successful Students and Less Successful Students on CCS Scales

		Successful Students (*n=65*)		Less Successful Students (*n* =53)			
Variable	*df*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*p* (2-tail)
Identity Conflict	115	2.23	1.105	1.82	.859	2.250	.026*
Perceived Acceptance	113	3.97	.805	3.73	.843	-1.577	.118
Cultural Conflict	108	1.68	.853	1.58	.720	-.659	.511
Relationships	114	4.05	1.019	4.06	1.079	.055	.956

Note. *$p<.05$

Table 14

T-test Comparisons Between Successful Students and Less Successful Students on LSAM Scales

		Successful Students (*n=65*)		Less Successful Students (*n* =53)			
Variable	*df*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*p* (2-tail)
Competing Time Demands	93	2.2500	.86406	1.9801	.89355	-1.492	.139
Benefits of School Attendance	90	3.8538	.80792	3.9850	.80815	.772	.442
Family and School Conflict	111	2.0656	.85145	1.7846	.77999	-1.817	.072
Family and School Congruence	110	4.4667	.66934	4.4231	.64841	-.349	.728
School Impact on Family Life	111	2.7213	1.04026	2.3654	.98410	-1.858	.066
Emotional Impact of School	111	2.6667	1.11867	2.3774	1.04194	-1.417	.159

Note. *$p<.05$

Table 15

Sample Participant Responses of the Impact that Going to College has on ESL Students' Family Life

	Sample Responses
Pride	My family is very proud of me and they support me, I feel self-confident. My family is proud that I am continuing school after graduating high school. They want me to be successful in life.
Support/Motivation	My family is very supportive since I'm the younger from my family and the only girl. All my three brothers have attended college (UH) and only three are currently in college, including myself. I have a very supportive family. My family help me to have motivation to continue my school.
Lack of Time with Family	I rarely have time to do things I need to or would like to do. I can't potty train my son or be there for him since I go to school full time and work full time. Well I get to spend less time with my kids and also I can't attend my kids while doing homework so I have to go to a place where I can concentrate. But at the end of the day I know it will benefit our future.
Happiness	My family feel happy because I was educate and have a good future life. My family they are happy for me because is good for my work.
Role Model for Family	At my age I have become the inspiration to my other family members to return to school. It is difficult sometimes to work, go to school and have to do all family things I have to do, but I am giving a good example to my children. They like me going to school and they try to help me with my school work when they can.
Other	It been hard because of my health but I won't give up a lot of time I push myself. It has made me to be more on a schedule type. I definitely set a side what we call "family day" to just best with my family-work and school free of worry.
Help Other Family Members	My family had received more help from an educator mother and wife. School has impacted my family life in a good way by expanding my knowledge on things and allow me to teach my family members things they don't know, or even thought of.
No Impact	There is really no impact, only in regards to the relationship with my sister. My family, excluding my sister is very unsupportive in the school aspect. I don't have close family in the US so is not an impact for them.
Better Future	They will have more confidence in me. My income may improve. I will make better decisions. My kids may be educated than I am. They impact my family life about my future and my family.
Improved Communication	Going to school has been a good impact in my life because learning another language is not easy and being in school full time helps. We have more communication about our life and goals we want to reach.

Table 16

Sample Participant Responses of the Impact that Going to College has on ESL Students' Work Life

	Sample Responses
Application of Skills and Knowledge at Work	I feel better now because I can implement what I learned in class at work, now I have a better understanding of my job thanks to some of the courses I took already. I work with children, so I applied my knowledge with them. I also get great ideas from the books and my class learning. Going to school I have improve more knowledge and help the children and the families at my work. I also love to make a big difference on these families that they need my help. School has made my job easier, because I work at a pre-school so I use my knowledge at work.
Better Future	It had helped me a great deal having knowledge of the children development. I have new and better insight in my field of early childhood. This is more opportunity for my life. I am getting more knowledge to be a better worker.
Conflict with Work	I am often preoccupied on an assignment instead of selling cars (sales person) at work. It has made me work harder at times. I work full time at night for a county hospital. Working at night and going to school during the day can be challenging most times I have to balance getting an adequate amount of sleep and being alert in school and work. I don't get to attend as many work functions but my boss is supportive and is patient with me. It has impacted me a lot of my job and getting a degree has been a great challenge for me.
No Impact	My job currently has nothing to do with my major and sometimes I use it as a hobby. My co-workers were pushing me almost as much as my family to go to school. It hasn't changed anything at work though. I have a stable job during something that I enjoy on a regular basis. It's not something I will do for a long time but it has helped me prepare and established good relationships with parents, students, and staff. My work gives me a flexible schedule for school.
Not Employed	At present, I am a full time student. When I finish my studying at MCC, I will go to work. I don't work for now. I don't work since I am an international student. N/A not currently employed at the moment. I do not work. I am a mother, so I have a full time job already.

Table 17

Sample Participant Responses of the Impact that Going to College has on ESL Students' Social Life

	Sample Responses
No Time to Socialize	Friends love that I'm back in school but don't like the fact that I have no time to see them. I no longer have a social life, this summer I am taking two classes. I have only gone out once this summer. I have spent my time with online class, portfolio, and keeping in shape. It has stopped me from having a social life because of the amount of hours I work and go to school. But it is worth it in the end!
Meet/Make New Friends	I get to meet lots of people from different cultures and background and as I get to know them I also learn about other cultures as well. Going to school has helped out my social life. There is so many new and interesting people at school that are full of great personalities. School has had the greatest impact on my social life. I am learning more about the American culture from young students straight from high school. I am also gain good friends with older students coming back to school. We have more in common with older students.
Improvement	I feel so confident that I know more than I knew two years ago. It gives more self-confident and speeds up my success. I have expanded my knowledge of knowing places, people and things because of the people I met here at school and the environment I am at. It has been very important to achieve and learn what I know any knowledge that I have grown.
No Impact	School has not impacted my social life. I put school before my social life. My social life is the same as in school or not at school. Nothing really has changed. I had always dedicated all my time just to my family.
Make Time for Friends/Supportive Friends	My friends recognize my efforts. I'm a social person. I love lots of foreign friends in Houston. We always hang out in my free times. Although is a lot of work the little free time I have is very enjoyable with the people I love, family and few close friends.
Other	I grew up in a rough neighborhood and I feel that my school life and social life contradict each other. I really meet no friendly people on this campus. I would like to make more friends regardless of the background, yet for some reason, it is somewhat of a difficult challenge. It is great to have something to look forward to, like earning a degree. That I believe sets a great example for my children.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

1. Age:
   ___ 18-22
   ___ 23-30
   ___ 31-36
   ___ 37-45
   ___ 46-55
   ___ 55+

2. Gender:
   ___ Female
   ___ Male

3. Ethnicity:
   ___ White
   ___ Black
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ Asian
   ___ Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander
   ___ American Indian/Alaskan
   ___ Other

4. What is your native language?
   _____

5. Do you read and write in your native language? ___ Yes ___ No

6. Marital status:
   ___ Single – never married
   ___ Married
   ___ Divorced/separated
   ___ Widowed

7. Do you have children? ___ Yes ___ No If yes, how many? ___

8. Living situation: With whom do you live?
   ___ Live alone
   ___ Live with family
   ___ Live with significant other
   ___ Live with friend or roommate(s)

9. Employment Status: How many hours do you work each week?
   ___ None
   ___ 1-10
   ___ 11-20
   ___ 21-30
   ___ 31-40
   ___ 40+

10. Extracurricular activities: Check any that you participate in on a regular basis.
   ___ Sports team
   ___ College club or organization
   ___ Church activities
   ___ Community volunteer organization

11. Current GPA: ___

12. How many hours are you currently taking at MCC? (Summer 2011)
   ___ 1-3
   ___ 4-6
   ___ 7-9
   ___ 10-12
   ___ 13-15
   ___ 16+

13. What degree or certificate are you planning to obtain from MCC?
   _____

14. Are you the first in your family to go to college? ___ Yes ___ No

APPENDIX C

COLLEGE ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (CASES)

Directions: For each statement below, circle the number that best represents your confidence.

Statement	Very little Confidence	Somewhat Unconfident	Undecided	Somewhat Confident	Quite a lot of Confidence
How much confidence do you have about doing each of the behaviors listed below?					
1. Taking well-organized notes during a lecture.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participating in class discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Answering a question in a large class.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Answering a question in a small class.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching).	1	2	3	4	5
6. Taking essay tests.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Writing a high quality term paper.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Tutoring another student.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Explaining a concept to another student.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Earning good marks in most classes.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Studying enough to understand content thoroughly.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Running for student government office.	1	2	3	4	5

Statement	Very little Confidence	Somewhat Unconfident	Undecided	Somewhat Confident	Quite a lot of Confidence
15. Participating in extracurricular events (sports, clubs).	1	2	3	4	5
16. Making professors respect you.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Attending class regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Attending class consistently in a dull course.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Making a professor think you're paying attention in class.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Understanding most ideas you read in your tests.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Understanding most ideas presented in class.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Performing simple math computations.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Using a computer.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Mastering most content in a math course.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

CULTURAL CONGRUITY SCALE (CCS)

Directions: These questions are to help us understand how our students feel at the college. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced the feeling or situation at Midtown Community College (MCC) by circling the number that best represents your experience.

Statement	Not at All	Rarely	Undecided	Most of the Time	A Great Deal
My experience is that at MCC…					
1. I feel that I have to change myself to fit in at school.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I try not to show the parts of me that are "ethnically or culturally" based.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I often feel that I have to change myself depending on the ethnicity or cultural background of the person I am with at school.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel that my ethnicity or cultural background is incompatible with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I can talk to my friends at school about my family and culture.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel I am leaving my family values behind by going to college.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My ethnic or cultural values are in conflict with what is expected at school.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I can talk to my family about my friends from school.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel that my language and/or appearance make it hard for me to fit in with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My family and school values often conflict.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel accepted at this school.	1	2	3	4	5
12. As a member of my ethnic or cultural group, I feel I belong on this campus.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I can talk to my family about my struggles and concerns at school.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E

LIFE SATISFACTION AND ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

QUESTIONNAIRE (LSAM)

These questions are to help us understand our students' life satisfaction, academic motivation, and competing time demands which include work-family-school conflict. For each of the following statements, circle the number which indicates the extent to which you have experienced that feeling or situation at Midtown Community College (MCC).

Statement	Not at All	Rarely	Undecided	Most of the Time	A Great Deal
My experience is that…					
1. My family is happy that I am attending MCC.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My school work takes up time that I would like to spend with my family.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My family dislikes how often I am preoccupied with my school work while I am at home.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My family supports my educational goals.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Because my school work is demanding, at times I am irritable at home.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My school demands make it difficult to be the kind of partner/spouse or parent I would like to be.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My family life takes up time that I would like to spend on doing my school work.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My family life often conflicts with my class schedule.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Friends at school dislike how I am preoccupied with my family life while I am at school.	1	2	3	4	5
10. When I go to school, I am too tired to do some of the things I would like to do.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My family life makes it difficult to be the kind of student I would like to be.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Going to school has benefitted my family.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My work supervisor is happy that I am attending MCC.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My class requirements take up time that I would like to spend on work.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My class requirements often conflict with my work obligations.	1	2	3	4	5

Statement	Not at All	Rarely	Undecided	Most of the Time	A Great Deal
17. My peers at work dislike how often I am preoccupied with my school demands while I am at work.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My employer and coworkers are supportive of my educational goals.	1	2	3	4	5
19. School demands often make me too tired to perform all aspects of my work.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Because my school work is demanding, at times I am irritable at work.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The demands of school make it more difficult to be relaxed at work.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My school life makes it difficult to be the kind of worker I would like to be.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Going to school has benefitted my work.	1	2	3	4	5
24. In general, how satisfied are you with your educational experience at MCC?	1	2	3	4	5
25. In general, how satisfied are you with your family life?	1	2	3	4	5
26. In general, how satisfied are you with your work?	1	2	3	4	5

Please briefly comment on how going to school has impacted:
Your family life:
Your work life:
Your social life: